The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 1892.

The Week.

THE Civil-Service Commissioners have done well to issue a proclamation calling attention to the provisions of the law which forbid political assessments and prohibit discrimination against or in favor of any employee by a superior because of his action in reference to contributions for political purposes. The request with which the proclamation closes, that any person having knowledge of any violation of the law lay the facts before the Commission, and the promise that "it will at once take action upon them," shows that its members "mean business." After such a declaration, it ought to be possible to get through the campaign without any of the old scandals about "voluntary contributions."

The Republican managers out West have evidently concluded that more is to be made this year by defying the Prohibitionists than by truckling to them. In State after State, conventions are held which refuse to put a single word regarding the liquor traffic into the platform, even though, as in Iowa, the last previous platform endorsed prohibition; or, as in Indiana, contained a local-option plank; or, as in Minnesota two years ago, endorsed high license and pledged the party to a continuance of this policy. It remains to be seen whether this change of base will prove to have been wise. There are signs, however, that in every such State the Prohibition party will cut more of a figure this year than ever before, and at present it looks as though the Republicans would lose fully as many votes to the third party as they can hope to keep from voting the Democratic ticket by their non-committal position on the liquor issue.

Mr. Robert P. Porter, Superintendent of the Census, delivered what the *Tribune* assures us was a "highly interesting and instructive address on the growth of religious denominations" at Asbury Park on Sunday. The speaker's effort in the main, says the same authority, "was to urge a federation of the churches with a view to more Christian harmony and less creeds." As Asbury Park is a rigid prohibitionist resort, there seems to have been a peculiar fitness in getting the enthusiastic advance agent of the "great Republican wine" to deliver an address there. The "Christian harmony" of the occasion might have been greatly enhanced by the reading of choice extracts from Mr. Porter's letter showing the skilful manner in which he had promoted wine-drinking among Republican statesmen. He sent five cases of the "great Republican wine" to the White House, another case to Cornelius N. Bliss, tried to get Vice-President Morton to buy some, and "was glad to hear that Mr. Whitelaw Reid is patronizing the wine which all true Republicans should drink." His struggles to make every hotel at which he stopped keep the wine, and thus spread the sway of the "demon drink," are graphically set forth in his letters. He "made a scene" in every hotel which did not keep the wine, and refused to drink any other, in one instance drinking Bass's ale instead—"Result—I am not feeling at all well to-day." Though born and reared in England, Porter has such a ferocious American stomach that English ale makes him ill. Finally, he induced Mr. Carnegie to make all the guests at his great tariff banquet drink nothing except the "Great Republican wine," and crowed about it as the grandest achievement of his career as a wine-agent. For aught the Asbury Park Prohibitionists may know to the contrary, Porter may have composed his address under the stimulating influence of American wine—not the brand which he "boomed" in his letters, for the proprietor of that is suing him in the courts for money advanced in the business, but some new brand which agrees better with his digestion.

There is a division of sentiment among Republican editors as to the wisdom of pushing the Force Bill issue. The Philadelphia *Bulletin* represents a class which opposes any further agitation of the matter, and questions whether such a law would do any good. Referring to Mr. Lodge's silence regarding the matter in his recent speech, the *Bulletin* says:

> "It is undoubtedly true that the practical value of any Force Bill is being doubted by more Republicans every day. Northern capital and emigration are doing for the South what legislation could not possibly perform. It is to these agencies that more conservative Republicans look to right the wrong; and if Congressman Lodge has joined this number, he has in all probability adopted the wiser course."

On the other hand, the New Haven *Palladium* takes the position that "the question of free suffrage and honest elections is one that takes hold of the foundations of our system of government"; that "the Republican party of to-day looks upon the question as the most important before the country"; that "the party is committed to the theory that free and honest elections can be best secured through Federal legislation and the protection of the Federal Government"; and that, "if Mr. Harrison is reëlected, there is no doubt that the most earnest efforts of his Administration will be extended towards the passage of a Federal election law by Congress similar to that which passed the House of Representatives of the last Congress."

A striking illustration of the importance of the Force Bill issue in the South is afforded by the recent action of ex-Congressman Ewart of the Ninth North Carolina District. Born of a Southern family, Mr. Ewart became a Republican in 1872, and was soon a prominent local leader in his party, being twice elected Mayor of Hendersonville, later a member of the Legislature, and in 1888 a Representative in Congress from a district which has a majority of white Republicans. The Force Bill came up during his first session, and he distinguished himself by making a statesmanlike speech against the measure. He characterized the Lodge Bill as "a sectional measure, designed almost entirely for the South," declared that "it would bring about bloodshed, terrorism, riot, and disorder," and told his Northern Republican brethren that the only remedy they could apply was to "mind your own business and treat the colored man of the South with 'wise and salutary neglect.'" Mr. Ewart's standing with his party at home was not injured by his revolt against the Force Bill. On the contrary, he is now stronger than ever. The district, which is always a close one, was carried by the Democrats in the "tidal wave" of 1890, but the Republicans hoped to recover it again this year, as in the last Presidential campaign. Mr. Ewart was universally recognized as their strongest man, and they asked him again to accept the nomination, but he has refused. His reason is that he cannot endorse the Force Bill feature of the Republican platform, and his opposition to this policy is so strong that he will vote the Democratic ticket as the only sure way of making his opposition effective. Mr. Ewart is by no means alone in taking this stand. A number of other prominent Republicans in the district have announced their intention to follow his example, and the party is likely to lose the district on this issue.

Even those who used to advocate the "Bill to Promote Mendicancy" now bear witness that the South has not needed appropriations from the Federal treasury to enable her to build up a good system of public education. Next to ex-Senator Blair, the Rev. A. D. Mayo was the strongest supporter of the scheme, and only a few years ago he was wont to declare that it was impossible for the South to get along without such help. Now he is delivering an address in which he says that "Virginia gives a five-months' free country school to its whole people, at an annual cost of $1,500,000; has rehabilitated its old academic and collegiate system, so that never before were so many of its youth in the secondary and higher schools; subsidizes the best institution for the training of the negro, and supervises

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the best seminary for the manual training of the white youth in the South; with State normal schools for both races." Other Southern States are but little behind Virginia, and the influence of her example is spurring on the laggards. The best feature of it is the fact that this great educational advance is the work of the South herself, paid for by her own people, and so much prized by them that they are willing to pay more for the same purpose every year, instead of a sudden and unhealthy growth, fostered by Federal bounty, and so dependent upon such bounty that it would wither if the supply of cash from Washington should be stopped.

One of the most absurd performances by Congress at the demand—or supposed demand—of Labor was the passage at the recent session of a law which says that no person shall be employed more than eight hours, "except in cases of extraordinary emergency," by the Government, "or by any contractor or sub-contractor upon any of the public works of the United States." Although there is room for a difference of opinion as to what constitutes "a public work," there seems no warrant for doubt that this law will be held by the courts to apply to all contractors who do work for the Government. The effect of such legislation was clearly stated during the discussion in the House by Representative Mutchler of Pennsylvania, who said:

"There are in this country a number of corporations which do work for the Government and also for private individuals and other corporations, and all this work is done by the same employees. Take, for instance, the town of Bethlehem, Pa., in my own district, where work is being done for the Government. The employers must necessarily, under such a law as this, have two sets of employees; one set engaged exclusively upon Government work, and the other upon work for railroad corporations or for private individuals. Look at the embarrassment and annoyance that a plant of that kind will be subjected to by such a law. When the eight hours have expired, those who are engaged on Government work must stop, leaving the others to continue, because they will go on to work two hours longer and thereby earn more pay."

Already this absurd law has advanced the cost of contract work in one case 20 per cent., and we fear the Philadelphia *Press* does not exaggerate when it estimates that it will cost the Government $20,000,000 a year.

The strike among the switchmen of the Reading system in Buffalo has come to a head so suddenly as to surprise the public, which reads of violent outbreaks of lawlessness almost before it was aware that there was any dispute between employers and employed. The trouble appears to have arisen over a demand for higher wages on the part of the switchmen employed in the yards at Buffalo. It seems that Buffalo is the dividing line between the Eastern and Western roads, and that the Western roads pay higher wages to all employees than do the Eastern roads, these higher wages applying to the switchmen of Western roads in Buffalo. The Reading switchmen in Buffalo demanded the same wages as are paid to switchmen of Western roads in that city, but the company refused to grant the advance, on the ground that they could not yield it without also raising the wages of their men in New York, Philadelphia, Reading, and everywhere else on the system, which was impracticable. The only question then remaining was whether the company could find men who were satisfied to take the places of the strikers at the old wages. The officials claim that they have plenty of such men, and the attitude of the strikers indicates that this claim was well-founded, for they immediately resorted to wholesale violence, evidently fearing that, if they maintained the peace, the company would have all the switches manned within a few hours. Of course the merits of the strike are no longer in question, as the strikers have forfeited all claim to consideration by their resort to arson, their attacks upon the Sheriff's officers, and their threats to kill any new men who dare take their places.

It seems clear that violence was deliberately adopted by the strikers as the chief feature of their "plan of campaign" before the crisis actually came. President McLeod quotes from the report of a meeting of the men held on July 22 the following passage:

"The Worthy Master said that the present occasion would be a good one to decide how the strike should be conducted. McNamara said he was in favor of using force should it become necessary to do so: that his plan would be to run cars off the track, go through the yard, knock holes in engine-tanks, cut hose, etc., so as to disable engines. Murray, Smith, and others spoke against too much violence; agreed, however, that a little would be a good thing."

At the same meeting it was arranged that the strike should be declared at midnight, and the Buffalo men gave their word that all arrangements had been made to run off the track and wreck freight and coal cars enough from twelve o'clock midnight up to two A. M. to block up the whole road for a week, as the yard was full of cars. This plan was carried out to the letter, and now that it has been carried out, it is virtually endorsed by the union to which the strikers belong. It is true that Grand Master Sweeny makes this perfunctory declaration of disapproval: "Of course, no lawlessness can be upheld. The men should win by peaceable means." But no striker is going to be deterred from further violence by reading such mild and meaningless words as these. As at Homestead, so at Buffalo, "Organized Labor" resorts to violation of the law as the only hope of achieving its end, and there comes from no organization of laboring men any effective protest against this policy. The end must be the same at Buffalo as at Homestead—a growth of public sentiment against all labor unions, so long as they are conducted in this way.

It would be difficult to conceive of a more flagrant abuse of executive power in cases of capital crime than Gov. Buchanan of Tennessee has committed in commuting the sentence of Col. Henry Clay King from hanging to imprisonment for life. Col. King was proved beyond question to have been guilty of as deliberate and cold-blooded a murder as any man ever committed. He walked up to his victim in the public streets of Memphis and, placing a pistol against his body, shot him without warning and without giving him a chance to defend himself. Every court in the State before which the case was tried pronounced him guilty of murder in the first degree. There were no extenuating circumstances, a fact which is sufficiently emphasized by the successive findings by several courts of verdicts of murder in a community, in which verdicts of that kind in "affairs of honor" are rare occurrences. That they were rendered against King, who had been a distinguished soldier in the Confederate Army and a brilliant member of the bar since the war, was an encouraging sign of advancing civilization in the State. The Governor has done all he could to check this advance by his indefensible course.

The *Tribune* asserts that "apparently" we did "not quote Senator Hiscock fairly" in respect to the effect of the tariff on farm products. The only quotation we made of the Senator's words was taken from his revised speech in the *Record*, where it stands precisely as we cited it. He said: "No one claims that they [agricultural products] were affected by the provisions of the McKinley Act." The *Tribune* regards this statement as "erroneous," inasmuch as the prices of "barley, live animals, of wheat, of eggs, and of some kinds of vegetables . . . and many other articles have been enhanced at some points in the country by the new duties imposed in the McKinley tariff." This raises the question whether the *Tribune* is able to quote fairly from itself. "Apparently" it is not, as on August 2 it declared that "the prices of food products were absolutely unaffected by the schedules of the McKinley Bill," and on August 4 it thought that "it can scarcely be necessary to explain that the new tariff was in no appreciable degree responsible for the change in the cost of food."

The continued fall in the price of silver is ascribed in some of the foreign journals to a prevailing belief that forced purchases of silver bullion by the Government of the United States will cease within a measurable period. This is a very reasonable supposition. Public opinion in this country touching silver is not what it was six months ago. The first symptom of change was the action of the House on the Bland Bill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was a House, be it remembered, that was expected to pass a free-coinage bill by a two-thirds majority. The Democrats had a two-thirds majority, and it was confidently predicted that there would be as many Republicans voting for free coinage as Democrats voting against it. Such was the common belief when the complexion of the House became known and for some time afterwards. Protection against a depreciated currency was looked for in a Presidential veto, and this Mr. Harrison virtually promised in his Albany speech about one year ago. He would hardly have taken pains to say what he did on this subject unless he had supposed that the danger was imminent. The Coinage Committee of the House was organized to put such a bill through under a high head of steam, but when the time came to report the Bland Bill, it was found that a most determined opposition to it had arisen, and when the vote was taken it failed to pass. Then the Democratic National Convention adopted a platform against free coinage on the present ratio of sixteen to one, and in favor of the unconditional repeal of the present Silver Law. Notwithstanding this plain deliverance, the Senate passed a free-coinage bill and sent it to the House, where it was beaten by a much more decisive vote than that which had been given on the Bland Bill a few months earlier.

Nobody will buy silver now except from hand to mouth. The market has got into the position that the promoters of the Anti-Option Bill wanted to make for wheat and cotton—those who deal in "futures" are out of it altogether. They have left silver to the manufacturers of tableware and ornaments, and to the few mints that continue to receive it for coinage. Our esteemed contemporary, the *Financial Chronicle*, thinks that the present decline may produce so much trouble in Europe as to give fresh interest to the coming conference, although it does not expect international bimetallism as a consequence. We have always maintained, and we now believe, that the greater the fall of silver, the smaller will be the chances of any action looking to its reinstatement as a money metal. The statesmen and people of Europe will congratulate themselves that they have little of it on which to make a loss—not more than they can easily manage. England's interest in India, in so far as it is commercial, differs in no wise from her interest in China, Mexico, or Chili, which are all silver-using countries. We never hear of anxiety in England on account of the silver currency of those countries. England's political interest in India is a trifle in comparison with her home interests, and these are strongly against bimetallism. England's greatest interest is that silver should sell for exactly what it is worth in a free market. This is the world's chief interest, our own included.

Mr. Gladstone's speech on August 9 marked the break-down of the last Tory prophecy, that he would not be able to handle his heterogeneous following. It was impossible even for his opponents not to admire the easy mastery with which he met the difficulties of his political situation. The Tory demand that he should announce his policy in detail before asking the Government to resign, he met by saying that never before had an Administration refused either to resign or to propose any policy in the face of an adverse majority returned in general elections, and, moreover, that there could be no Liberal policy until there was a Liberal Cabinet. The Conservatives had got a great deal of comfort out of the foregoing speeches of the Irish members, who had pretty plainly laid down the conditions on which they would support a Liberal Government, but Mr. Gladstone's remarks on Irish affairs were so skilfully conceived that he dissipated the Tory hopes of an Irish defection. He pledged himself on the general question of home rule in such a way that no Irish member could vote against him, and yet he refused to commit himself, as some of the Irish extremists wished, in regard to evicted tenants and imprisoned agitators. Some of them, especially the Parnellites, will vote with him with much grumbling, yet they will vote. In short, the prediction that Mr. Gladstone would fail for lack of tact and finesse in dealing with the Parliamentary situation was about the most baseless fabric of a vision imaginable, and the Tories have had to fall back on the dismal prophecies about his failing strength.

The tactics and taunts of the Opposition to Mr. Gladstone in Parliament are unintelligible on this side of the water. A majority of forty is larger than we are accustomed to see in the House of Representatives at Washington, although there happens to be a larger one now. Any party which shall enter the next Congress with the same proportionate strength that the Liberals have in the House of Commons, will be esteemed strong enough for all purposes. Of course our executive government is not a committee of the House of Representatives, and hence the conditions are not parallel. Nor does a majority here consist usually of parts of a party, as the Liberal majority is now made up. But on this point it must be said that on the main question at issue the Gladstonian parts are just as well united as the anti-Gladstonian. If the former consist of Liberals and Home-Rulers, the latter consist of Conservatives and Liberal Unionists. The cohesion of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. McCarthy is quite as likely to be permanent as that of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain. One advantage possessed by the Opposition—that of holding the negative in debate and not being responsible for anything — it would be useless to ignore, but neither should that advantage be anticipated before the new Government is announced. All of Mr. Chamberlain's taunts are wasted upon our ears because we do not understand a system of government under which they would be considered appropriate or even permissible. The first thought of every American, when a new government comes in power, is to give it a fair chance and not to condemn it before it is tried. Yet the whole of Mr. Chamberlain's indictment and of all the rest of the Opposition speeches was tantamount to saying: "You have a majority, but you cannot use it; you are strong enough to turn us out, but you are not strong enough to govern the country after you come in." As that is the very thing to be proved, and as it can be proved only by experiment, we, in our provincial way, should say that such taunts might be best postponed for a few months—more especially since nothing under heaven can now prevent the Gladstonians from ruling till next February at all events.

The session of the Austrian Reichsrath just closed has been unusually rich in legislation. Besides deciding on the reform of the currency, the two houses have approved of important commercial treaties, and adopted proposals looking to the development of the city of Vienna and the steady employment by the Government of large numbers of laborers, in the regulation of the River Wien, the construction of canals, etc. This activity has unquestionably redounded to the credit of the Taaffe Government, to whose direct initiative all these measures were due. The German Liberal party has but grudgingly supported Count Taaffe and given him a working majority. It has just suffered a great loss in the death of Dr. Herbst, its most eloquent leader against the aggressions of the Czechs, whose demands grow louder and louder. In Bohemia the conservative counsels of the old Czech leader, Rieger, have been contemptuously set aside, and in Carinthia, Carniola, and Styria the Slovens are imitating the Young Czechs in their opposition to the German Liberals and in their insistence on the predominance of the Slavic tongue. Laybach, particularly, the capital of the province of Carniola, and ten or fifteen years ago to all intents and purposes a German city, has been gradually transformed into a Slavic one, and the Government has connived at the change, even overlooking a protest of the Municipal Council of Laybach against the festivities connected with the unveiling in that city of the statue of the great Liberal poet Count Anton Auersperg. It would not be strange if the German Liberals should refuse to serve Taaffe's purpose much longer, and should once more come out in open opposition to him. Seemingly sure of the Emperor's favor, he will rule with them if possible, and without them if necessary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW YORK AND THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE.

IT is noticeable that the political figurers upon both sides are talking about the possibility of winning the Presidential election without the electoral votes of the State of New York. On the Republican side it is claimed that the addition of six new States in the Northwest, with a total of twenty electoral votes, has greatly increased their chances for electing their candidate without the aid of New York. On the Democratic side it is claimed that the success of their party in recent elections in Iowa, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, and the division of the electoral vote of Michigan, make it entirely possible that they should lose New York and still secure a majority of the Electoral College.

In order to judge of the merits and demerits of these claims, let us consider some of the possible combinations which might occur to justify them. The Electoral College of this year, compared with that of the last Presidential election, dividing the vote as it was cast in that election, is as follows:

REPUBLICAN STATES.	Old Ap.	New Ap.
California	8	9
Colorado	3	4
Illinois	22	24
Indiana	15	15
Iowa	13	13
Kansas	9	10
Maine	6	6
Massachusetts	14	15
Michigan	13	14
Minnesota	7	9
Nebraska	5	8
Nevada	3	3
N. Hampshire	4	4
New York	36	36
Ohio	23	23
Oregon	3	4
Pennsylvania	30	32
Rhode Island	4	4
Vermont	4	4
Wisconsin	11	12
Totals	233	249

DEMOCRATIC STATES.	Old Ap.	New Ap.
Alabama	10	11
Arkansas	7	8
Connecticut	6	6
Delaware	3	3
Florida	4	4
Georgia	12	13
Kentucky	13	13
Louisiana	8	8
Maryland	8	8
Mississippi	9	9
Missouri	16	17
New Jersey	9	10
North Carolina	11	11
South Carolina	9	9
Tennessee	12	12
Texas	13	15
Virginia	12	12
West Virginia	6	6
Totals	168	175

NEW STATES			
Idaho	3	Washington	4
Montana	3	Wyoming	3
North Dakota	3	Total	20
South Dakota	4		

The new colleges will consist of 444 votes, and 223 will be necessary for an election. If the Republicans were to carry the same States this year as they carried in 1888, they would have a majority and 26 votes to spare without the aid of the 20 votes of the new States. It will be seen that of the additional 23 votes which the old States have gained by the new apportionment, 16 are in the States which were carried by the Republicans in 1888 and only 7 in the States which were carried by the Democrats in that year. The Republicans have, therefore, reckoning on the party divisions of the last Presidential election, a net gain of 29 votes—that is, if we count the 20 votes of the new States as surely in their favor.

If we divide the States in accordance with elections which have been held since 1888, placing in the Democratic column States which have been carried by that party in two successive elections, the showing will be very different. The votes of New York, Iowa, and Massachusetts, 64 in all, will be transferred from the Republican to the Democratic side, making the Democratic total 239, or 16 more than the requisite electoral majority. This division still leaves Indiana, with its 15 votes, in the Republican column, and leaves there also the 14 votes of Michigan; but Indiana is confessedly a doubtful State, and at least four of the Michigan votes are conceded to the Democrats in the next election. Recent elections in Rhode Island have made that also a doubtful State, and it is admitted by all fair-minded judges that reasonable doubts may be entertained of the result in Wisconsin, and even in Illinois, this year.

In order to make a basis for combinations, however, let us take from both columns all the States that are by common consent pronounced "doubtful," and thus get a basis of reasonably certain States for each party. In view of recent elections the doubtful list must include the following:

New York	36	Massachusetts	15
Indiana	15	Total	85
Connecticut	6		
Iowa	13		

Giving the Republicans the 20 votes of the new States, this reduces their sure vote to 190, and the sure Democratic vote to 169, without making the Michigan division. Placing the Michigan vote at 10 Republican and 4 Democratic, the totals of sure States on each side will be Republican 186, Democratic 173. In order to win, therefore, the Republicans must gain 37 votes and the Democrats 50. The Republicans could win with any one of the following combinations:

Sure Republican States	186
New York	36
Massachusetts or Indiana	15
Total	237
Sure Republican States	186
New York	36
Iowa	13
Total	235
Sure Republican States	186
New York	36
Connecticut	6
Total	228
Sure Republican States	186
Iowa	13
Indiana	15
Massachusetts	15
Total	229

It will be seen that, in order to succeed without New York, the Republicans must carry every doubtful State and all the Pacific Coast and Northwestern States. Turning to the Democratic side, we have the following possible combinations:

Sure Democratic States	173
New York	36
Indiana or Massachusetts	15
Total	224
Sure Democratic States	173
New York	36
Iowa	13
Connecticut	6
Total	228

Giving the Democrats five instead of four votes from Michigan, making their sure total 174, we have:

Sure Democratic States	174
Indiana	15
Iowa	13
Massachusetts	15
Connecticut	6
	223

The Democrats could also win without New York and with only four votes from Michigan, provided they should carry, in addition to the four States enumerated above, Rhode Island or Montana, and the latter State has shown many signs of uncertainty in recent elections. They could also win without New York, or Iowa, or Connecticut if they could gain the twenty-four votes of Illinois, as follows:

Sure Democratic votes	173
Indiana	15
Massachusetts	15
Illinois	24
Total	227

It is obvious, however, that the vote of New York is the all-important factor in the calculations upon both sides, and that the candidate who receives that will, in this contest as in all previous ones, stand by far the better chances of election. Still, the Michigan division has introduced a new element of uncertainty, and it is by no means impossible that the result may be decided by that.

MORE CHILIAN AFTER-THOUGHTS.

A FRESH crop of explanations in regard to the conduct of our diplomatic and naval officials in Chili marks the return of Consul McCreery to this country. He himself has a delightful tale to tell of the consuming love of Chilians for Americans, affirming that "there is not a particle of truth in the stories of ill-feeling on the part of Chilians against Americans." This is enough to bring President Harrison back to Washington in hot haste, to see personally to the dismissal of a subordinate who could thus coolly contradict the head of the nation. In a certain Presidential message the assertion was made, it will be remembered, that the "populace" in Valparaiso was "animated by hostility to the Government whose uniform the sailors and officers wear." But what the Consul has to say is not of so much importance as the published letter of Francis W. Egan and the article of Theodore Roosevelt in last week's *Independent*.

Mr. Egan, as might be expected from a member of an old American family, is especially strong in denouncing the "devilish malice" and "lying attacks" of such recent and unpatriotic immigrants as the Trumbulls, whom he has detected in the act of "currying favor with their English clients." But we cannot pause over the sublime spectacle of young Egan's patriotism; his explanation of Admiral Brown's conduct is the principal thing that requires consideration. It coincides in the main with that advanced by that expert in Chilian affairs, Mr. Roosevelt. Both think it a complete vindication of the American naval officer to say that the landing at Quinteros was known to the Balmacedist officials in the morning of the day in the afternoon of which he steamed up to the scene of the disembarkation. Admiral Brown went up there, says glib Mr. Roosevelt, "fulfilling his duty." This is a great advance over the best explanation ever before given of the Admiral's action—even his own—namely, that he went

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out of idle curiosity. If he had any "duty" to perform on the Chilian coast, it was to protect American lives and property. A similar duty rested upon the other foreign war-ships in Valparaiso harbor, and, strangely enough, they thought they could best fulfil it by staying where they were. Admiral Brown, however, according to Mr. Roosevelt, thought the best way to protect Americans was to go where there were none.

Now, it has never been denied, so far as we know, that the insurgent squadron had been sighted off Quinteros before Admiral Brown went up there. The charge against him is, that he brought back more accurate and detailed information than was had before in Valparaiso, and that he gave his opinion, of the highest military value to the Balmacedists at the time, that the movement was not a feint, but a definitive landing. Says Mr. Roosevelt: "Not one shred of evidence has been offered in support of the malicious slanders" against Admiral Brown, and he thinks it is to the "infinite discredit" of the papers which have circulated these charges that such is the case. Now, there have been at least two shreds of evidence on this subject printed again and again, and it is to the discredit, infinite or otherwise, of any one making the above assertion that he ignores them. For Mr. Roosevelt's benefit we reproduce them once more.

On the morning of August 21, after Admiral Brown's return to Valparaiso and interview with the officials, a Government paper came out with the announcement of an impending battle, and added: "From trustworthy information brought by the American man-of-war *San Francisco*, we know for a fact that the revolutionists have landed at Quinteros, etc." When Admiral Brown reached San Francisco, some months later, he denied roundly that any such statement had been published in any Chilian paper, although copies of the original were then in more than one newspaper office in this country. This denial will do to go with his other one, that no despatch was sent by any one on his ship, except a cipher message to Washington; the latter has since been made to look particularly silly by the production of a facsimile of a cable message sent in plain English by his own flag-officer to a New York newspaper. The other "shred" is the following telegram, sent early in the morning of August 21 to Balmaceda himself by Intendente Viel:

"The American Admiral has left me only this moment, and he believes, as I do, that a reëmbarkation is not possible."

We have never seen any explanation or denial of this telegram. Secretary Tracy had his attention called to it by the Washington correspondent of the *Evening Post*, and complacently remarked that he thought it very likely the Admiral had talked over the military situation with Viel. If that is neutrality, what would be gross partisanship? If that is a model of discreet conduct "beyond praise," as Mr. Roosevelt calls it, what lengths would Admiral Brown have had to go to call for condemnation? Mr. Roosevelt demands "frank and humble apology" from those papers which have published the charges without any proof. We think that an apology for "baseless slander" is indeed due from somebody, but will leave it to Mr. Roosevelt, on reflection, to say from whom.

A fitting climax to the artificial patriotism displayed so freely throughout this whole Chilian affair has been the lying in state of the body of the murdered sailor, Riggin, in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. It was made perfectly clear by the papers of that city that the whole scheme was devised by one Philadelphia journal as a means of advertising itself. It had worked up a "Riggin Fund," and induced Mayor Stuart to give his consent to the exhibition in Independence Hall. The other papers, aware of the clap-trap nature of the whole performance, called upon the Mayor to rescind his action, pointing out, with entire justice, that an honor heretofore paid only to the remains of Henry Clay and Abraham Lincoln ought not to be cheapened by coupling it with an advertising dodge of a newspaper. But the Mayor had gone too far.

A TARIFF FOR WAGES ONLY.

In his examination before the Congressional Committee, Mr. Frick maintained a very bold front except at one point—when he was asked the labor-cost of producing a ton of steel. Though questioned on that head more than once, he refused to answer. This refusal he justified on the ground that he should not be expected to make public a business secret; but there are those who suspect that he was afraid of coming into collision with his former declaration that the tariff had nothing whatever to do with the Homestead troubles. However that may be, there is no difficulty in getting at an approximate answer to the question put to Mr. Frick. The cost of production of iron and steel has been the subject of many expert inquiries, and from them a fair estimate of the labor-cost may be derived, even if it should be true that the labor-cost to the Carnegie Company were less, and their profits correspondingly greater, than in the case of business competitors.

The thing to make plain at the start is, that the modern Republican doctrine of protection has come down to the explicit assertion that the tariff is put upon foreign competing goods "to make up the difference between the wages paid in the United States and the wages paid in Europe." That was the language held by McKinley, in his speech in this city on June 21; and to make his meaning still more unmistakable, he added:

"Whenever Europe will give to her workmen the same wages that we give to ours, then we will remove our tariffs and meet her in the neutral markets of the world, and it will be the survival of the fittest. Elevate your condition up to ours, and we will demand no protective tariff against the goods made by your labor. And I will tell you when we can have free trade in this country. It will be when the nations of the world will bring their social and labor conditions up to ours, for we will never level ours down to theirs. That is what a protective tariff means."

In this, of course, he was but expounding the plank in the Republican platform which says that the duties should be "equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home." No more explicit form of words could be chosen to say that if the duty on steel rails, for example, is greater than is demanded by the difference between the labor-cost in this country and in Europe, it is too great and should at once be brought down to exactly that difference. On the other hand, if the strikers at Homestead can show that their wages do not eat up all the protection on the goods they produce, but that a part of it is lost in extra profits to the manufacturers, then they have the authority of McKinley himself for demanding those profits as their lawful due.

Now, in the matter of steel rails, the United States Commissioner of Labor, Mr. Carroll D. Wright, prepared in 1890 a statement showing the labor-cost per ton in this country and in England. He based his figures on the cost of production all the way up from the ore and coal and coke to the finished product, and found the entire labor-cost of a ton of steel rails in this country to be $11.59. But the McKinley duty is $13.44, which is $2 too much on the new McKinley theory, even if the British manufacturer could produce rails without any labor-cost whatever. But when we find from the same investigation that the labor-cost in England is $7.81, we see that the tariff protection, on the principle that the "difference in wages" alone should dictate the rate, ought to be no more than $3.78 per ton. In other words, McKinley made his rate nearly four times as high as his own rule called for. The *Iron Age*, which no one ever suspected of understating the case for protection, recently gave the labor-cost of a ton of wire rods as $1.95; yet the tariff duty is six-tenths of a cent a pound, or $12 a ton—more than six times the labor-cost.

The tables of the last census relating to wages and cost of production are not yet available, but reference to the first annual report of the Commissioner of Labor and the report of the census of 1880 on wages will show how far from the truth is the late Republican discovery, that the protective tariff is solely to make up for the difference between wages in this country and in Europe. From the voluntary statements of manufacturers gathered in the reports referred to, it appears, for example, that the labor-cost of producing a pair of five-pound blankets is 35 cents; the duty on them in the tariff of 1883 was $1.90. Instead of lowering that rate to make it cover difference in wages and no more, McKinley increased it. The labor-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cost of a yard of four-ounce flannel was 3 cents; the 1883 duty was 8 cents, and McKinley put it higher. A gallon of linseed oil involves a labor-cost of 2 cents; the tariff of 1883 made it dutiable at 25 cents, and McKinley raised the rate to 32 cents. It would be easy to extend the comparison indefinitely, and show how thorough a "fraud" is the "Republican protection" for wages only.

All this relates solely to the theory on which Republicans now claim, the protective tariff is constructed. As to the practical effect of a high tariff on wages, it appears, from the investigation of the Senate Finance Committee, that wages have slightly fallen in highly protected industries and risen in non-protected. The published abstract of the results arrived at by the Commissioner of Labor, in his inquiries into the same subject in connection with the census, points strongly to the same conclusion. The N. Y. *Tribune* promptly sounded a note of alarm when Mr. Wright gave out his general results, and said that a false impression might be made by his hasty figures, and plainly intimated that the full report ought to be suppressed—at least until after the election. If the Republicans were content to join the ranks of the economists who say that a high tariff has nothing to do with wages, except to increase the cost of living and so indirectly to lower them, they could escape from some of the awkward questions suggested by the Homestead troubles. But as long as they maintain that the tariff is solely to keep up wages, they will all the while be running up against facts which show their professions to be fraudulent and their practical results delusive.

AN UNWORKABLE THEORY.

THE relations between workmen and their employers, never in very stable equilibrium, have been of late exceptionally disturbed, with the usual result of calling forth much good advice to both parties. In so far as this advice represents public opinion it will not be without effect, for neither laborers nor capitalists can be insensible to the feeling with which they are regarded in the community, any more than they can be insensible to the state of the atmosphere which envelops them. But in so far as this advice implies the acceptance of certain economic principles, its value depends upon the truth of these principles. If they are untrue, or if they have been generally represented to be untrue, it is hardly fair to blame workingmen for being reluctant to accept advice which assumes their truth. American laborers are, as a class, extremely intelligent, but even intelligent people may be misled by the statements of those who profess to be experts, and in our opinion they are now suffering from a misapprehension of some fundamental economic truths due to the fallacious teaching of some professed economists.

The unscientific spirit of this teaching is manifested perhaps most conspicuously in a very general exultation over the "explosion" of the wages-fund theory. It may be as well to say flatly that no such explosion has taken place. Undoubtedly, some writers have made absurd and exaggerated statements about the wages-fund, but all that is essential in this theory remains true and indispensable in any political economy that will work. No one who reflects can deny that the laborers employed upon a certain piece of work must be sustained while the work is being done, and this sustentation is the wages-fund. The element of time is the essential one, for in almost all modern industry the product is not consumed by those who produce it, but is exchanged for other products; and until the processes of production and exchange have been completed, which cannot be done instantly, there is nothing available for the laborer's support. It is true that a portion of his support he may himself provide, but this is immaterial, as is the circumstance that his employer may borrow his capital. What is true and important is, that, as a rule, in all modern industry, laborers engaged in any department of production are supported out of wealth already produced and not out of wealth to be produced. It is well enough to talk of the share of the laborer in the product, and to speak of the partnership existing between capital and labor, if these expressions are not taken literally; but unfortunately they often are taken literally.

Thus it is said by some, as, for instance, by Mr. F. A. Walker, that the laborer is not supported by the wages-fund, because he often lives upon credit until his job is completed, when his wages are paid to him out of the product or its proceeds. Others maintain a similar doctrine, that as the laborer works he becomes entitled to a certain share in the product, which really constitutes his wages. It ought to be enough to say in reply to these theories that the laborer cannot eat or wear credit, but must have food and clothes, and that these must have been created before he began his work. As to the second statement of the theory, we need only ask whether the laborers employed on the Panama Canal received as their wages certain undivided shares in the useless excavations that scar that isthmus. The same illustration exhibits the fallacy involved in the "industrial partnership" theory. The French investor knows well that the wages of these laborers were paid to them out of wealth that he had saved, and that in meeting the losses of this partnership he had no assistance from the partner who furnished the labor.

For it is essential to a partnership that there should be a community of losses as well as profits, and if it is true that the laborer's wages come out of what he produces, when that product has no value he gets no wages. The consequences of ignoring this obvious truth are very serious, for nothing is more common than for sentimentalists to dwell upon the large profits of some particular enterprise, and to insist that the laborers are entitled to their share of them, in addition to the wages for which they agreed to work. If these economists followed their reasoning out to its logical result, they would find themselves obliged to hold that when an enterprise fails, the laborers ought to repay to the capitalists the wages which were advanced to them out of a value that did not "materialize." Yet the "heads I win, tails you lose" theory has been represented as applicable to the laborer's case so generally, by the press and from the pulpit and the professorial chair, that it is not surprising if many laborers feel that the present method of fixing their wages deprives them of remuneration to which they are justly entitled.

As to the exceptional profits of particular enterprises, it is well to bear in mind that men of wealth seldom put all their eggs into one basket. The stock in a profitable concern is probably in most cases owned by men who own stock in many other concerns, some of which are very unprofitable. Their income is derived from the whole mass of their investments, good and bad, and if they were compelled to accept only a part of their gains while they bore all their losses, there is little doubt that the spirit of enterprise, so important to the interests of the community, laborers included, would be discouraged. This spirit demands the prospect of exceptional profits, for if there is no hope of large gains from a new venture, there is no motive for assuming a new risk. Perhaps it should be added that we are not considering a case where exceptional gains are due to exceptional fidelity and capacity in the laborers employed. In such a case, it is safe to say that a management sufficiently intelligent to be prosperous is likely to be sufficiently intelligent to understand the causes of its success, and to see that its employees do not become less efficient through dissatisfaction with their reward.

Taking a general view of the industrial field, therefore, it seems that capital is everywhere maintaining labor, paying wages whether the enterprise is profitable or not, and applying its exceptional gains to offset its exceptional losses. If it apparently, like the Lord of the Vineyard, pays the same wages for services that differ widely in productiveness, this is not done arbitrarily, but in pursuance of laws that are perhaps on the whole as beneficent as any substitutes that could be devised by human ingenuity. Certainly, the attempt recently made on the part of the laborers at Homestead to assert the existence of "vested interests" in the plant there, has made it manifest that the economic theories above criticised do not work well when reduced to practice. There is and there has been no "industrial partnership" there; nothing but a bargain on the part of capitalists to pay specified wages to laborers, let the issue as to pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fits be what it might. There may be said to have been an explosion there, but it was not an explosion of the wages-fund theory, but of the theory that holds that wages are paid out of the anticipated products of the future, and not out of the existing products of the past.

AT BODENSTEDT'S BIRTHPLACE.

PEINE, HANOVER, July 23, 1892.

IT would be interesting to make a dozen persons read Bodenstedt's famous songs of love and wine, and then have them guess in what kind of place the poet was born and brought up. Probably not one would descend in his thoughts from the gorgeous scenes of the Caucasus, where the singer has entertained him with the Oriental wisdom of Mirza-Schaffy, to anything like the sober plains between Brunswick and Hanover, where he would find the cradle of Bodenstedt in the prosy little town of Peine. It is true, Ernst Schulze as well as Hoffmann von Fallersleben might come to mind, both born in the same region and both poets of some note; but the contrast between their poetry and their early surroundings is not so striking as in Bodenstedt's case. The once monotonous Lüneburger Heide has furnished more than one poet; only special circumstances and experiences, however, could combine to produce such a seeming anomaly as the author of "Mirza-Schaffy."

When Bodenstedt was born, in 1819, Peine was a town of 3,000 inhabitants; when he died, three months ago, it had 8,000. In earlier times it was a strong fortress; at present it is a manufacturing town and quite an important railway station. An unusually large number of its houses still show the old-fashioned extremely low upper stories, with windows like mere loop-holes, but many have already been rebuilt in modern style. Such has been the case with the stately mansion of the Bodenstedts, which faces the market square, and attracts the attention of the visitor by the tablet bearing the name of the poet and the date of his birth, but still more by the large sign which invites hungry and thirsty souls to enter and refresh themselves in the Mirza-Schaffy Restaurant. Surely this is just as it should be, for no visible or external surroundings could make one appreciate Bodenstedt better than good wine and viands on the table, appropriate selections from his songs written out on wall and ceiling, and a picture of the genial singer looking down upon the cheerful feaster.

Bodenstedt's father was one of the prominent citizens of Peine, a self-reliant, self-exacting man of more than common intelligence and sagacity. He cared for the physical development of his son with something like Spartan rigor, but he also gave him the best mental training possible. The boy's grandmother was a rhymester, and the boy himself early began to imitate her, but soon concluded that nothing short of life's actual experiences would ever make a poet of him. It was this longing for the wide world, this desire to find something worth expressing, and the impulse to express it in artistic form, which made him accept a place as tutor in a Russian family at Moscow when he was but twenty-two, and could hardly be said to have finished his own studies at home. There he passed three pleasant and profitable years until he was called to the position of a teacher or professor in the Gymnasium at Tiflis, where the frequent holidays and the long summer vacation, in all about six months out of twelve, gave him abundant time to pursue his private investigations of the tribes of the Caucasus and to study various Eastern tongues. On his return to Germany, late in 1845, he went first to Göttingen and thence to Munich. From 1854 to 1866 he was professor of the Slavic languages in the Bavarian capital, and from 1867 to 1869 superintendent of the theatre in Meiningen. Afterwards he lived the life of a writer, journalist, and editor in Berlin, Trieste, Wiesbaden, and other cities; a life of which the principal interruption was his visit to our shores in 1880, or, as one might be tempted to call it, his triumphal procession from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Pacific back to the Atlantic.

When a poet is taken from us, it is natural and perfectly fair to ask how much of his work will outlive him and his age; but it is not fair for his contemporaries to forget how much even that which is likely soon to die has pleased and delighted them in days gone by. Our fast-living age is only too apt to forget this, and seems to be in danger of doing so with Bodenstedt. If, ten years ago, he was extolled too highly by his countrymen in America, he now appears to be underrated by some of his countrymen at home. That he was not a truly great poet is no new discovery, nor should it be laid to his charge; but to say that he was essentially shallow and too easily satisfied with the popular success of his Mirza-Schaffy songs is hardly just and true; for, light and frivolous as many of his ditties may sound, there are not a few passages in his prose as well as in his poetry which betoken an essentially serious nature. But, however this may be, to fix Bodenstedt's place in German literature will devolve upon a future generation; all that could possibly be done now, in an adequate critique, would be, and should be, to survey his activity as a man of letters in general, and to ascertain what this activity meant or still means for his own day and generation.

Bodenstedt accomplished several things for which he should be remembered. He served his countrymen as interpreter and translator of foreign thought. He left behind him valuable memoirs, and he made a large and lasting contribution to the world's cheerfulness in giving us his songs. Russia, Persia, England, and America—all are the better known to Germans and students of German for his having lived and written among us. His 'Reminiscences' can hardly fail to interest the historian of literature, for Bodenstedt's friends and acquaintances were numerous, and his reflections on men and affairs, though by no means always profound, often throw a side-light on events of importance. His songs, again—those, at least, which were set to music by composers like Rubinstein and Franz—speak for themselves, and constitute that portion of his work by which he is most likely to live. Much of what he wrote on St. Petersburg, Moscow, Tiflis, and Constantinople, and much of what he wrote on or translated from Shakspere, Hafiz, Pushkin, Lermontoff, Kolzoff, Derzhavin, and Turgeneff, has lost its value and interest or has been superseded. But we ought to recall that, when he began his literary career, little or nothing was known on many of the subjects which he took up and rendered intelligible.

Moreover, he not only introduced Germans to the literature of Russia, but also Russians to that of Germany. When he went to Moscow, in 1841, he was still commonly mistaken for an Englishman because he came from a Hanoverian town. Beyond the names of Goethe and Schiller, and a few of their more popular works, German literature was a book with seven seals to Russians, and that which then constituted the literary life of Germany could not but confuse and disgust even the closest and fairest foreign observer. Heine and Börne were railing, first jointly at German politics, and afterwards at each other. Heine and Immermann were pitted against Platen; Gutzkow against Menzel; Börn against Wilibald Alexis; and, to make confusion worse confounded, Börne, Menzel, and Gutzkow together were picking flaws in Goethe and Schiller. In many Russian homes and families where these writers, not excepting the greatest, were scarcely known by name, Balzac, Dickens, and Thackeray were read and studied with astonishing eagerness. Hence, what an opportunity for the clever and enthusiastic young Bodenstedt to correct, teach, and enlighten! And this opportunity he seized and improved faithfully.

Of Bodenstedt's wide circle of friends and acquaintances it is impossible to speak here at all; nor can more than bare mention be made of his visit to the United States. Americans should read, in his 'Morgenland und Abendland,' the verses which commemorate this visit. Some of them will be found to be very prosy; others, for example the lines on Minnehaha and the little violet on the banks of the Mississippi, are truly musical and poetic. Interesting, too, are the sentiments expressed in his "Farewell to America":

"Leb wohl, Amerika, du Welt im Werden!
Aus unsrer Alten Welt erhabnen Trümmern
Vereinigst du, was Grosses ward auf Erden,
Und brauchst dich um Vergangnes nicht zu kümmern,
Derweilen wir noch stets vom alten Fluch
Zu dulden haben, der Geschichte Buch
Durchforschen müssen, gründlich zu erfahren,
Wie lang wir Narren der Geschichte waren.

. . . . . .

Leb wohl, Amerika! Was in dir Grosses,
Kann nur der Dummheit Neid und Hass erregen."

Of course, we notice at once that these lines resemble Goethe's

"Amerika, du hast es besser," etc.,

but what is of far greater interest than this resemblance is the fact, recorded here once more, that "the past," or what we call "history" and tradition, if dwelt upon to morbidness and heeded too anxiously, may become a fetter which makes men "fools" indeed. And it is from such fetters that even the highly civilized European feels himself freed when he first reaches the shores of the less civilized New World; freed too often, however, only by way of reaction, for further experience not infrequently teaches him that progress with absolute disregard of the "past" is just as blind as progress for ever looking backward is slow.

Let me conclude these reflections in the Mirza-Schaffy Restaurant with a few lines from the poet's 'Morgenland und Abendland,' which I take to be not only sincere, but also true and characteristic of him:

Mit allem, was ich weiss, nahm ich es immer gründlich,
Mein Geist ist ernst, allein mein Herz ist leicht erzündlich.

. . . . . .

Oft ward ich unverdient gerühmt,
Oft auch getadelt unverblümt,
Doch der schärfste Tadel, den ich vernommen,
Ist mir stets aus dem eignen Herzen gekommen."

X.

BARDOUX'S LAFAYETTE.—I.

PARIS, August 5, 1892.

M. BARDOUX is one of our Senators, representing the department of the Puy-de-Dôme. He belongs to what we call, in our classification of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties, the Left Centre, which means the moderate Republican. He was for a brief period Minister of Public Instruction. A man of some culture, he has published several books, the best of which are 'La Comtesse Pauline de Beaumont' and 'Madame de Custine,' as he had original documents to help him in writing these biographies. There is also a volume on 'Le Comte de Montlosier et le Gallicanisme.' I take no account of 'La Bourgeoisie Française,' which deals with generalities. M. Bardoux's style is very defective; there is in it a certain sort of fluidity which borders on what the French call "fadeur." It often aims to be eloquent when it is only commonplace. M. Bardoux is fortunate to have found some good subjects, and to have chosen interesting heroines and heroes; they have helped him more than he has helped them. This can be said essentially of his new work, 'La Jeunesse de Lafayette (1757-1792).' The youth of Lafayette is all the more interesting to study as he remained, so to speak, young all his lifetime. His passions were, at the end of a long life, what they were at twenty. You may judge of the style of M. Bardoux by this phrase: "If our heart brings back or fixes our sensibility on the day, happier than all others, of which we dream when we reënter into ourselves, this day was for Lafayette the one on which the generous wind of the eighteenth century blew him over to America."

Marie-Paul-Joseph-Roch-Yves-Gilbert of Motier, Marquis of Lafayette, was born on September 6, 1757, in Auvergne, in the old castle of Chavagnac. His father, Colonel of the Grenadiers of France, was killed at the age of twenty-four, a short time before he was born. At the age of fourteen, he entered, like all the gentlemen of his time, the military academy of Versailles. He was tall, red-haired, serious, awkward; he danced without grace, and did not ride well. As early as seventeen he was married to Adrienne d'Ayen. The Duc d'Ayen, eldest son of the last Marshal de Noailles, had five daughters. Adrienne was one of them; Pauline, another, became Madame de Montagu, whose memoirs have been published. Adrienne was only fourteen years and a half old. The Comte de Ségur, who was the uncle of Lafayette, writes in his Memoirs that "till he was eighteen years old, Lafayette had a grave and cold countenance which wrongly betokened embarrassment and timidity. This exterior coldness and little disposition to talk formed a great contrast to the petulance, frivolity, and loquacity of persons of his age; but this envelope concealed the most active mind, the firmest character and the most ardent soul."

Lafayette belonged to the most brilliant set of courtiers, headed by the Comte d'Artois, Havré, Guéménée, Durfort, Coigny, the two Dillons, the two Ségurs, the Comtesse d'Aremberg, the Duchesse de Fronsac. They met at an inn, near Porcherons, called the "Épée de bois." These young people were Anglomaniacs, and thought it necessary to drink much to be very English. "Don't forget to tell Noailles," said Lafayette one day to the Comte de la Marck, who was one of the set, "how much I drank," after having taken more champagne than usual. This life of dissipation did not last long. Lafayette was at Metz when he heard the news of the American Revolution from the mouth of the Duke of Gloucester, who was dining at the Governor's (the Comte de Broglie, the hero of the 'Secret du Roi,' one of the historical works of the present Duc de Broglie). Before the end of the meal, Lafayette had conceived the idea of going to America and of offering his services to "the insurgents" (or "Bostoniens," as they were then called). The sentiment of France was all on the side of the American colonies; the English game of whist was replaced by another game, "Boston." Was there not a curious symptom in this sympathy shown for the revolt of a people against a King? To be sure, some political calculation was mixed up with this generous sympathy; it was felt that if the thirteen colonies fell again under the yoke of England, France would soon lose her colonies in the West Indies.

The Comte de Ségur had formed the project of embarking for America with Lafayette and with the Vicomte de Noailles. The Comte de Broglie was let into the secret. He tried at first to hinder Lafayette from following out his resolution: "I saw your uncle die in the Italian wars; I was present at the death of your father at the battle of Minden; and I will not contribute to the ruin of the only remaining branch of the family." It was in vain. In vain, too, did the Duc d'Ayen fly into a great rage against his son-in-law. Society pronounced in favor of Lafayette and against the Duc d'Ayen. Lord Stormont, the English Ambassador, wrote to his Government: "If the Duc d'Ayen crosses his son-in-law in such an enterprise, he cannot hope to marry off his daughters." Lafayette entered into communication with Silas Deane, and signed an engagement. In order the better to cover his enterprise, he went to London, where he remained three weeks; he returned to Paris, left for Bordeaux, after having taken leave of his wife and of the Comte de Ségur, and succeeded, not without many difficulties, in embarking on the 26th of April, 1777, on his ship, which he called *La Victoire*.

M. Bardoux gives us several letters written by Lafayette on board the *Victoire* to his wife; they are in the sentimental style of the eighteenth century. Lafayette had left a child behind him, Henriette (who died during his journey), and his wife was on the eve of her second confinement. He tells his wife that he is glad to change his futile life for a useful life:

"In going, as a friend, to offer my services to this very interesting republic, I bring with me only my frankness and my good will—no ambition, no personal interest. In working for my own glory, I shall work for their happiness. I hope that for my sake you will become a good American. The happiness of America is intimately connected with the happiness of humanity; it is going to become the respectable and safe asylum of liberty."

On July 16, 1777, after six weeks afloat, Lafayette landed in Georgetown, S. C. He stopped first at the house of Major Huger, and left for Charleston, from which place he went on horseback, accompanied by six officers, to Philadelphia. He was for a moment coldly received—the Americans had been disgusted with the conduct of several French adventurers; but when the letters which he bore from Franklin and Deane to the Chairman of the Commitee on Foreign Affairs were read, there was a marked change, and on July 31 Congress accepted the services of Lafayette and gave him the rank and commission of Major-General in the American army. The meeting of Washington and Lafayette was very cordial. Washington invited Lafayette to inspect with him the forts of the Delaware and to consider his headquarters as his own house. "We shall be embarrassed," said Gen. Washington, "to show ourselves to an officer who leaves the French army." "I am here to learn and not to teach," answered Lafayette.

At the battle of Brandywine, Lafayette received a ball in his leg. He wrote to his wife September 12: "The English have gratified me with a ball which has slightly wounded my leg; but it is nothing, my dear heart, the ball has touched neither bone nor nerve." Some time afterwards, he writes to her:

"Now, as the wife of an American officer, I must give you your lesson. They will tell you: 'They have been beaten.' You will answer, 'It is so; but old soldiers always have the advantage over young ones, and they have killed many more of the enemy than they have lost themselves.' Then they will add, 'All right! but Philadelphia is taken, the capital of America, the bulwark of liberty.' You will answer politely: 'You are fools. Philadelphia is a sorry city, open on every side, and as a port was already closed. Being the seat of Congress has made it famous, I don't know why.' If they continue to press you with questions, you will send them to . . . in terms which the Vicomte de Noailles will tell you."

Lafayette was confined to his bed for six weeks, but, before his wound was quite closed, he rejoined the headquarters, where he heard the news of the capitulation of Burgoyne at Saratoga. I will not attempt to enter into the details of the participation of Lafayette in the efforts of the American army. I will only cite a few passages from his letters. On January 6, 1778, he writes to Madame de Lafayette, from the camp at Valley Forge:

"It is in a camp in the midst of the woods, it is in the heart of winter, that I find myself chained. . . . Don't you think I need very strong motives to make such a sacrifice? Everything bids me go away, honor bids me stay; and really when you learn in detail the circumstances in which I find myself, in which the army finds itself, my friend who commands it, all the American cause, you will forgive me, my dear heart, and I dare say that you will give me your approval."

It was resolved by Congress that the American troops should invade Canada, and Lafayette was chosen to command the expedition; but he said at once to the Commissioners of Congress that he would accept no command independent of Washington, and that the title of aide-de-camp to *him* seemed to him preferable to all the titles which could be given him. He therefore refused the title of Commander-in-Chief, and would only be an officer detailed by Washington. These conditions were accepted, but the expedition, in the heart of winter, could not take place.

In a letter signed by Lord Carlisle, one of the Commissioners sent from London in order to try to conciliate the colonies, the French nation was "taxed with a perfidy too well known to need fresh proof." (France had just made her treaty of commerce with the United States, had allied herself with them, and given them a formal recognition.) Lafayette was incensed at these words, and challenged Carlisle, who refused to fight a duel. Washington did not approve of the conduct of the young Marquis—the *boy*, as he was sometimes called by the troops. Lafayette himself wrote, twenty years afterwards: "Lord Carlisle was right."

He wrote to his wife before asking leave from Congress to go and offer his sword to France, who was at war with England: "The news of the war has been brought here by a French fleet which comes to coöperate with the American troops. New operations were on the point of beginning; we were in the midst of a campaign. It was not the moment to quit the army. . . . The moment, however, now approaches when I shall rejoin you, and next winter will see me united to all those I love."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence.

OUR MUDDLING COPYRIGHT ACT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In your very kindly and appreciative review of my little book on 'The Horse,' which appeared in the *Nation* of the 7th of July, I observe a criticism on a singular error which occurs, I presume, in the American edition, for which I am not in any way responsible.

Your reviewer justly condemns the sentence which he quotes from p. 160, as follows: "The scapula is of complex shape, with strong projecting processes. In the horse (see Frontispiece) the humerus especially, so prominent a feature in the scapula of man, being scarcely visible. There is no trace of a clavicle."

In the English edition (of which alone I have seen a proof) the corresponding sentence (p. 149) stands thus: "The scapula [of man] is of complex shape with strong projecting processes. In the horse (see Frontispiece) the scapula is a very much simpler bone, long, narrow, flat, with the processes much less developed, the acromion especially, so prominent a feature in the scapula of man, being scarcely visible. There is no trace of a clavicle."

The suppression of so much of the sentence and substitution of "humerus" for "acromion" does certainly, as your reviewer says, "mar the precision of statement" aimed at, if not always attained, in the book. In justice to myself, I shall be obliged by your giving publicity to this note. I hope there are no similar instances of variation in the two editions.

Yours very faithfully, W. H. Flower.

British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, S. W., August 3, 1892.

[Prof. Flower is a victim of our stupid requirement of American manufacture to insure copyright.—Ed. Nation.]

THE PROGRESSIVE MACHINE INDEX.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The answer to the criticism on the "Progressive Machine Index and Card Catalogue" published in the *Nation* of May 19, 1892, has been delayed until now, when a practical test in this library enables me to reassert the claims made for it by Mr. Cheney at the conference of the A. L. A. in San Francisco. Though improvements necessitating new patents will still delay, for a short time, a full explanation of the machine, enough can be said to indicate its advantages over the card catalogue.

The progressive machine proposed for this library (at present under advisement of the Board of Trustees) will consist of seven cases, enclosing twenty-one drums, with a storing capacity of over 2,000,000 entries. Each letter, except the very short ones, has a drum to itself, showing at one view about four pages of printed matter the size of those of the Peabody Catalogue. This is one advantage, and a very decided one, both for the public and for the cataloguer, whose work is simplified and facilitated by a conspectus of the matter in the process of arrangement. A good deal might be said on the advantage to the cataloguer, but I will say simply that experimentation has satisfied the cataloguers of this library that there is a saving of time and brain-labor greater even than was anticipated, and which can be appreciated only by actual use of the machine.

It has been demonstrated in this library that there *is* a "saving in time, in brain-work, and in investigation." And as to the "saving in pen-work, or type-writing, or printing," another advantage disputed by your correspondent, I have only to describe the method of work. The entries for the machine are clipped from library catalogues and publishers' lists of recognized authority, pasted upon cardboard prepared for the purpose, then inserted in the linked plates. The plates, being easily put in or taken out of the machine, this work is done at the cataloguer's table, and, when finished, inserted in the machine. No calculation need be made for space for future entries, as all the insertions are movable, and new plates may be put in wherever it is necessary. By using printed matter already carefully revised, greater legibility and accuracy are secured, in addition to the speed. To facilitate the cutting of the entries for insertion, we use a machine which separates neatly single nonpareil lines though the spacing be less than one sixty-fourth of an inch. Consequently, when the plate is filled, the edges fit so closely together that it has the appearance of one solid page.

To the above advantages must be added that of a catalogue always brought down to date. A new book may be entered at once in its proper place in the machine alphabet, where the public has the immediate use of it instead of being obliged to wait for the publication of a bulletin. There is never more than one alphabet to be consulted, while with the card catalogue there must be at least two—the general alphabet and the alphabet of books not yet bulletined.

Now let us take up, for a moment, the saving in money. This library, it is decided, must have a new catalogue. Printed, it would make three volumes, of 1,000 pages each, the size of the Peabody Catalogue. To prepare and print these here would cost about $25,000, and the time required would be about six years. The work can be done on the machine as proposed—21 drums—for $8,000, and in a time not to exceed 400 working days. Moreover, should it be thought best to print, $7,000 can be saved by using the machine *simply for "copy."* The printing can be done from the plates, which make the best of "copy," and the catalogue can be in continuous use during the printing, maimed only to the extent of, say, five plates sent daily to the printer. I need not enlarge upon the saving in corrections and in proofreading and the gain in accuracy.

The progressive machine, simple in mechanism, and durable, used as a catalogue, reduces the cost of cataloguing by two-thirds. The saving by using it as "copy" has been before indicated; and the work, always down to date, can be as elaborate as the cataloguer has skill and patience to make it. Certain publications contain a regular monthly list of 70 to 100 topics in leading periodicals. These can be taken out bodily, pasted on cardboard, the proper shelf number written in the margin, cut, and inserted in the machine in about an hour.

As to space, a machine with three independent drums and cranks, containing over 3,000 leaves, size and contents of one full page of Peabody Catalogue, would require less room than a card-catalogue case of twelve drawers, which could hold, at most, 45,000 cards.

Finally, your correspondent says further, "The drawback of the scheme is, that the person who consults it prevents all other persons from using it at the same time." Let us see. In this library there is an average daily attendance of 600 people. Of that 600, 9 per cent. read current periodicals which require no consulting of the catalogue, and 51 per cent. use entirely our printed fiction catalogue, which leaves 40 per cent. to consult the general catalogue. Forty per cent. of 600 visitors would be 240 people, consulting 21 sections during 12 hours, or 13 people to each letter. This gives each consulter almost an hour on a letter. The above calculations have been made on statistics covering several years, and will hold good in any library of which we have the reports. But did all our 600 patrons consult the progressive machine proposed, my experience warrants me in affirming that the public would be better served than they are at present, or than they could be served by the best printed catalogues and the accompanying bulletins. I have thoroughly tested the machine, and shall soon be ready to place it at the disposal of Eastern libraries, when practical tests will support the results of our experience here.

Very respectfully, A. J. Rudolph,
First Assistant Librarian.

San Francisco Free Public Library,
August 3, 1892.

THE SEXES AS PUPILS AND TEACHERS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Comment was made in your columns not long ago on the fact that more girls than boys completed the grammar and high-school course. How widespread this custom may be in the East, I am not prepared to say, but it is certainly true of the Central States, and especially in and about Chicago, where I have had charge of a public school for the last ten years. Last year I graduated from the eighth grade (the final year of the grammar school) a class of twenty-six, of whom twelve were boys—quite an exceptionally large percentage.

In his last report, President Nettelhorst of the Chicago Board of Education remarked on the fact that of the 3,000 teachers employed in the Chicago public schools, only 190 were men, and lamented the fact that women were supplanting men as public-school teachers. In my mind the two facts are closely related—indeed, are cause and effect. Pupils finish the eighth grade at about fourteen or fifteen years of age. Boys brought up in a busy, "hustling" American community, where the commercial rather than the literary or scientific spirit is active, are loath to stay in school anyhow, but especially so when they see an apparent vista of four years longer of petticoat government in the high school. Women have the patience to teach six-year-olds how to spell "cat" and how many 3s there are in 12; but women are not, as a rule, so successful as men of equal education in interesting larger boys in civil government and the broader aspects of American and English history, for example. Whatever the psychologic difference between masculine and feminine mind may be, young breadwinners and future voters seem to take to that portion of humanity which is interested in, say, free trade and the Australian ballot rather than in millinery and needlework.

In rural communities, women are employed because they are cheaper, and because the old derivative idea of a pedagogue as a slave who leads the child to and from school, prevails to a greater or less extent. Why women should be employed as principals to the exclusion of men in large Western cities, is hard to say. Perhaps it is because the rapid growth from a country village has not given men's minds time to adapt themselves to changed surroundings. Perhaps it is an exaggerated idea of women's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights. Perhaps it is exaggerated American chivalry. A visit to Chicago schools would show that many large schools of, say, a thousand or more pupils, are managed by women entirely, many of whom are elderly, nervous, and destitute of culture or broad ideas. As Superintendent Howland said, "The principal is the unit of the school." Under certain restrictions he shapes the entire policy of the school; and his personality, his ideas, and his character pervade the entire system. Under such conditions, place in the office a fussy, fidgety, unliterary, unscientific old woman with a "good political pull," and what kind of a school have you? Boys don't like it.

What President Harper in the new Chicago University may do is hard to predict, but certainly he should raise the standard of scholarship and appreciation thereof in Chicago. There is no place where a college-bred man can do more good to a greater number, at less pay and with less credit or appreciation (save in his own inner conscience), than as principal of a grammar school in the West. When Chicago gets its growth, and men have time to think of their children more and their pocketbooks less, they will insist that the head of a grammar school shall be a man of collegiate (or equivalent) education. E. L. M.

COLLINGWOOD, ONT., August 12, 1892.

[Our woman-suffrage friends will be apt to insist that to qualify women teachers to "interest larger boys in civil government, etc.," they must have the same motive and the same opportunity for informing themselves that men have.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

THE Century Co. will have ready in October 'Old Italian Masters,' consisting of Mr. T. Cole's engravings and his own and Mr. W. J. Stillman's text, already well known to the reading and art-loving public from the foretaste in the *Century Magazine*. A more costly proof edition of 125 copies of the cuts will be issued in portfolio, with the text in a separate volume.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. promise a volume of late verse from Whittier, 'At Sundown,' with illustrations by Garrett; and 'Songs of Sunrise Lands,' by Clinton Scollard.

J. B. Lippincott Co. have in press a 'Boys' Book of Out-door Games and Recreations,' edited by G. A. Hutchinson; 'Memoirs of W. Nelson Pendleton, D. D., Brigadier-General C. S. A., Chief of Artillery, Army of Northern Virginia,' by Susan P. Lee; and a 'Handy-book of Literary Curiosities,' by William S. Walsh.

J. G. Cupples Co., Boston, will reprint, with illustrations in color, Edward Roth's 'Christus Judex: A Legend of the White Mountains.'

Messrs. Putnam offer to send to any person who has purchased their edition of Talleyrand's Memoirs a four-page sheet for insertion at the close of the last volume. It contains Talleyrand's latest act, a retractation of the errors of his life, and a letter of submission to Pope Gregory XVI. These characteristic documents were strangely withheld from the English translators of the Memoirs.

The *Bookman*, in its announcement of the Rev. Dr. Wright's 'The Brontës in Ireland,' says that the story of Mr. Birrell, repeated by Mr. Leslie Stephen in the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' that the real name of the family was Prunty, has no foundation.

Prof. J. H. Middleton's 'Illuminated Manuscripts in Classical and Mediæval Times; their Art and their Technique' (Cambridge, Eng.: University Press; New York: Macmillan) contains an answer to almost every question likely to be put concerning its subject. The first four chapters, which relate to the origin of books in all nations prior to the art of printing, ought to be a part of the furniture of every cultivated mind; and the same may be said of chapters x, xiii-xvi. The connection between the art of illumination and that of the weaver, the painter, the designer in stained glass and in mosaic, the jeweller, the goldsmith, is made plain; and, in the chapters not enumerated above, the achievements of the illuminators of the best epoch in each European country are set forth in detail from the finest specimens that have come down to us, with the aid of copious illustrations and abundant bibliographical references. A great deal of subsidiary information is packed away in footnotes, and is sometimes as remote as (for example) the date at which sugar, from being sold by the ounce as a costly drug, came into general use in Europe as an article of food. Prof. Middleton's arrangement is orderly, and his repetitions can readily be forgiven him; but not so the omission of an index, the need of which is crying.

The "Dilettante Library" (Macmillan) adds to its numbers two volumes on Browning and Whitman. The first, 'Browning's Criticism of Life,' by William F. Revell, endeavors to set forth in fresh terms the substance of Browning's ideas on God and man, love and knowledge, with the same results reached by other students who have made clear the imperfect measure of the poet's Christianity and the confusion of his philosophical scheme. The essay, however, is in the manner of a worshipper, and the stimulating and suggestive power of Browning is made much of, as it should be, though the fact that we do not look to poets for finalities of thought might have been more clearly acknowledged without injury to Browning's fame.

The second volume, 'Walt Whitman,' by William Clarke, might not unfairly be described as a socialistic tract in disguise. The author undertakes an exposition rather than a criticism of Whitman, and goes on to make the comment equal the text. The more interesting portion to us is his criticism of America, in which he antagonizes Arnold's somewhat specious dictum that we have solved the political and social problems, but not the human one. Mr. Clarke is of opinion that we have solved none of them. The Constitution broke down, he says, on the slavery matter, the only "serious" political problem we have had; and then loom up, one after the other, in his survey, our "Millionaires' Club," municipal government, luxury, laissez-faire, coal-barons, Pinkertons, etc., a procession as long as *Banquo's* line. The comparison with England is altogether to the advantage of that country. "The capitalist system of America is that of England, only more despotic, ambitious, and less scrupulous. . . . Pinkerton detectives shoot down unarmed men and women, and even children—an incident which could not be imagined in England; and it seems to cause but a ripple of mild protest even from excellent and kind-hearted people." This was written before recent events which must have hardened Mr. Clarke in his notions. But this, notwithstanding certain elements of truth, is a long-distance view, just as is his critical estimate of Whitman as the organ of democratic speech. The truth is that there is far more of idiosyncrasy than of our common national character in Whitman, and he represents America as incompletely as the Chartist poets represented the England of their day. Social agitation, however, rather than literary estimate, seems to be the reason for this book's existence.

Among recent reprints, Mr. G. A. Aitken's edition of Marvell's 'Poems and Satires,' in two volumes of "The Muses' Library" (Scribners) is at once the most tasteful and welcome. The previous issues of the series have familiarized the eye with the beautiful typography and mechanical execution of the volumes. The editor, whose work upon Steele earned him a deserved reputation for minute scholarship and research, contributes an excellent Life of the poet, and adds notes illustrating and elucidating the contemporary references, of the greatest value to the student, particularly in the case of an author so much mingled with his time as Marvell. The character of the severe patriot, as became a friend of Milton, is defended vigorously against recent attack upon him, and, altogether, we have Marvell now, in this edition, not only in a dress befitting a poet of strength and grace strangely blended, but also invested with a personal dignity and manhood befitting the poet of Puritanism.

Mr. Austin Dobson has brought out a reprint, limited to 500 copies, of Fielding's 'Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon' (Macmillan), the original edition, including the "Fragment of a Comment on Lord Bolingbroke's Essays." The edition is printed on hand-made paper and bound with simple taste. The editor's work consists of a brief account of the variation between the first and later editions, with the conclusion that the shorter one is the earlier, certain passages being omitted out of consideration to the living; and, besides, he adds several pages of notes of the sort of detail which proceeds from an acquaintance with the literature of the time, as if it were as accessible and inquisitive as the daily newspaper. This antiquary's knowledge, as it were, is nowhere more useful and often entertaining than in the decades of the last century. The sentence of Lowell, that Fielding best exhibits his own personality in the 'Journal,' fitly stands at the beginning of the volume.

We do not rate the critical faculty of William Hazlitt as highly as some recent writers, but the reprint of his 'Lectures on the English Poets' (Dodd, Mead & Co.), originally delivered in 1818, is an interesting specimen of the criticism of that age outside the reviews, and sheds some light upon the temper of the time. As a whole, the work is exceedingly scrappy and facile, reminding one of Edwin P. Whipple in a way, though Whipple lacked the gall of Hazlitt. The free speech in which Hazlitt indulges with respect to his own old acquaintances, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Lamb, would hardly be countenanced to-day except on the score of an eccentric old age, which still has its privilege. The labored distinctions between this and that, contrasting violently with the vague flow of words about poetry and genius, are also of the past. We cannot say more of the lectures than that they are a better sort of review in a time whose reviews are held in no great honor, and that their contents, in point of thought, penetration, knowledge, and that orderliness which proceeds from a trained mind, have been surpassed by scores of volumes written since their day. To the historical student, or to one who has formed a taste for Hazlitt's "bite," they may serve a purpose; but the general reader will not lose anything by leaving them alone.

The fact that our early literature, from 'Beowulf' to Chaucer, has a wide strand of religion in it, has not usually been mentioned

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a view to recommending Cædmon and Langland and their lesser brothers for ordinary recreation or even instruction; but it is just this which has led Prof. T. W. Hunt, whose work has been noticed several times in our columns, and always, we believe, with a fair measure of praise, to devote a volume to these elders who never heard Emerson's new commandment of the Muse, "Thou shalt not preach." Dr. Hunt, under the title 'Ethical Teaching in Old English Literature' (Funk & Wagnalls), has really written an interesting account of the driest period of our literature, and, by availing himself of the antiquarian research of the last twenty years, has a long story to tell. He adds to the value of his summaries by giving extracts from the works of the shadowy figures of the first 500 years of English literature, reckoning from Cædmon; and, gathering vigor from this attempt, he does the same labor of appreciation for the still darkened years from Chaucer to Ascham. He particularly recommends his work to clergymen, but if any one desires a readable account of the most unreadable of mummied literature, he will hardly fare better than with this volume.

'Popular Studies of Nineteenth Century Poets,' by J. Marshall Mather (Frederick Warne & Co.), gathers in a thin volume a half-dozen lectures, originally prepared for workingmen's classes, on Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Byron, Hood, Tennyson, and Browning. They are slight in substance, rhetorical in manner, and very sound in morals. Such lectures, delivered *viva voce* to an interested class, might well be of service in their limited way; but in a book their defects become too apparent, their crudity annoys, and their rhetoric wearies.

The intrinsic value of the newspaper polemics gathered by Mr. Paul Leicester Ford in his 'Essays on the Constitution of the United States published during its Discussion by the People, 1787-1788' (Brooklyn: Historical Printing Club) is naturally inferior to that of Mr. Ford's companion 'Pamphlets on the Constitution.' Still, some of these series of letters are long and carefully elaborated, like Oliver Ellsworth's ("A Landholder"), which fills 64 pages, to say nothing of Elbridge Gerry's and William Williams's and Luther Martin's replies to him. James Sullivan, also ("Cassius"), fills 48 pages. The index is not quite adequate, as may be noticed in the case of William Williams's argument in favor of "putting God in the Constitution" (as the object of our latter-day movement has been called). The few entries under Slavery do not misrepresent the relative rank of this topic among the objections to the Constitution. The animadversions on the Senate fail to discern the peril to State politics of making Senators eligible by the Legislature, and so subordinating the State aspect and function of that body to the Federal, and forcing the State party divisions to coincide with the national. Ellsworth has a just phrase—"The danger of the Constitution is not aristocracy or monarchy, but anarchy." The collection is a valuable recovery of contemporary discussion from out-of-the-way sources.

The Bureau of Education has added three numbers to its series of monographs on American educational history edited by Dr. Herbert B. Adams. No. 11 is the history of the higher education in Michigan, by Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin; No. 12 a similar history for Ohio, by Prof. George W. Knight and Prof. John R. Commons; No. 13, for Massachusetts, by George Gary Bush. All these are illustrated with views of buildings and grounds.

Still another issue from the Bureau is a long and fervid essay on "Southern Women in the Recent Educational Movement in the South," by the Rev. A. D. Mayo. The topic is one of very great importance. The following passage is pertinent to a recent discussion in these columns: "Up to the actual college age," says Mr. Mayo, "the girls, from the age of ten to eighteen, are already in overwhelming majority in the Southern schoolroom wherever I go." In one of his public addresses (1881) in the appendix Mr. Mayo speaks of "a large body of Southern young women . . . revealing the most intense desire for a superior culture, and the intention to take up the work of teaching with a will, in city or country, in the white *or negro* schools." Has this body ever been discovered by any other observer? There can, we think, be no question that the attitude of Southern white women towards Northern white women come to teach the blacks in a spirit of philanthropy has been the greatest obstacle to the spread and efficiency of these missionary efforts. Mr. Mayo now says, on p. 95, that the teachers from the North do not crave "social recognition," but do long and pray for "sympathy, confidence, and communion with the Christian women of the South for aid in their difficult work."

We can see only a happy innovation on the part of Mr. Arthur Winslow, State Geologist of Missouri, in choosing the folio form for his report on the first sheet of the Survey of that State. This choice was dictated by the sheet itself, which, on a scale of nearly a mile to an inch, represents an area of about 230 square miles, each side measuring a quarter of one degree. The sheet is thus conformable to those of the United States Geologic Survey, and, to avoid on the one hand folding and pocketing, on the other a separate map cover, the flat form is frankly adopted and the letterpress made to correspond with it, the whole making a not unwieldy brochure. The Survey begins in Lafayette County on the line of the Missouri River, and in a rich agricultural and promising coal-mining district, of which Higginsville is the principal town and railroad centre, giving its name to the sheet. This geologic and topographic contour map has been beautifully executed by Julius Bien & Co. of New York. We need not remark on the accompanying report.

Admirers of the humming-birds will find much to interest them in a paper, "The Humming-Birds," by Robert Ridgway, separately published from the Report of the United States National Museum for 1890, pages 253 to 383, having forty-six plates, besides illustrations in the text. Half of the work is given up to generalities—history, distribution, colors, nesting, feeding, and other habits, structure, etc.; the remainder contains descriptions and figures of species found in the United States, Mexico, Cuba, and the Bahamas.

At this year's national competition, held in July, of the 584 schools and classes connected with the Science and Art Department of the South Kensington Museum, London, the women students have met with preëminent success, carrying off five of the eight gold medals, and winning a large share of the lesser honors. More than 67,000 drawings, paintings, and modellings competed, coming from many parts of the kingdom. The rewards gained by the women covered a field so broad as to embrace first places for drawings from the nude and modellings from life, time sketches for figures in low relief, illustrations for children's stories, designs for book illustration, for a stained-glass window representing the nursery tale of the "Babes in the Wood," and decorative designs for textile fabrics, pottery, fans, and laces.

—We regret to learn that the Boston Public Library no longer exercises that discretion which led it, by an enlightened view of its duties and its interests, to grant to persons actually engaged in authorship the privilege of occasionally drawing books, although non-residents. The custom which has been discontinued was a generous one, but it illustrated the liberal public spirit which Massachusetts men desire to have characterize their institutions. It is certainly not far beyond the sphere of a great public library that it should assist literature upon necessary occasion or proper convenience; yet, at present, the loan of a book only for a few hours is refused. It is to the advantage of such a library that men of letters, although non-residents, should be interested in it, and the Boston Public Library profits by that interest; but so strict a rule, enforced in so absolute a way, may well bring in its revenges, if it is understood that literature in the person of its authors must always plead its privilege in vain. It may be that the custom was discontinued through some laxity in granting the privilege; but that a professional author requiring a volume for immediate use for a few hours should be denied, is an incident so unfit to happen in a city justly proud of its eminence as a centre of books, that notice of it may fairly be taken with a view to directing attention to the excessive rigor of the new rule.

—Certainly the most liberalizing event of this year's proceedings of the British Medical Association, just held at Nottingham, was the "extraordinary general meeting" called for the special purpose of considering the motion of Dr. J. H. Galton of London, "(1.) that Article 4 of the articles of the Association be altered by expunging the words 'no female shall be eligible for election as a member of the Association.'" The disabling clause it was proposed to expunge had been added to the original articles by vote of a large majority of the members in 1878. Several suggestive statements and admissions were made during the debate preceding the final vote. Those who had vigorously urged the exclusion of women for the past eighteen years, but who were now prepared to rescind their former votes, defended their action mainly by the fact that as women had, in spite of all opposition, entered the medical profession, it was illogical to continue to refuse them the lesser glory of society membership. The battle had been won by those women who, during the past twenty years, had, however severely handicapped, taken University honors and complied with the requirements of the most exacting medical examining bodies in the world. A barrier, therefore, by which in 1878 over 3,000 men opposed the possible admission of the eight English women then eligible for membership, has been levelled as useless in 1891, when there are in Great Britain 140 registered women physicians, and "more coming" from the schools successfully established for them in London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Dublin. The women having turned the flank of the enemy, graceful surrender was the only policy. The President of the Association presided at the meeting, well supported by the Council, and there was a large attendance of members, of whom much more than the requisite three-fourths voted in favor of Dr. Galton's enfranchising motion. This motion was appropriately seconded by Mrs. Garrett-Anderson, M.D., the soli-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary woman who had gained admission before the prohibitory amendment was passed at the Bath meeting in 1878—an instance of poetical justice not often witnessed within so short a period as fourteen years.

—*La Réforme Sociale* for August 1 contains a paper on attempts made to cope with the liquor evil in the city of Marseilles. Up to 1871 the evil had not assumed alarming proportions, but since 1875 the consumption of spirituous drinks has increased from about 400,000 gallons to 1,320,000 gallons for a present population of 403,749, making three and three-tenths gallons per head, while the consumption per capita in 1875 was only one and a half gallons; the number of places where liquor is sold has increased during the same time from 2,400, being one dram-shop for 132 inhabitants, to 4,309, one for each 93 of population. In some streets there are three or four liquor-stores next door to each other, in others there are fourteen such places in thirty successive houses; one enterprising dealer has put up an automatic bar, where all kinds of drinks can be had by dropping a two-sou piece in a slot. About six years ago public attention began to be directed to the necessity of doing something to stem the rising tide of intemperance, and various measures of repression were urged upon the municipal authorities; the only one adopted was an increase in the octroi tax, which went into effect in 1889, but which, instead of diminishing the consumption, only increased the revenue. The other measures which had been proposed but not carried out were a diminution of the number of dealers, a vigilant supervision, and the establishment of free laboratories where the poor could have liquors analyzed. Finding that no relief could be had from the constituted authorities, and that private effort was the only alternative, the initiative was taken by the Savings-Bank of Marseilles, of which the author of the article referred to, M. Eugène Rostand, is the President. Such action may not seem, at first sight, to fall legitimately within the functions of an institution of that kind, but it arose from the consideration that the money squandered by the working classes on unwholesome liquors is so much in reduction of their savings, and that the latter will increase if the former can in any way be diminished. During the past five years the amount spent for drink in Marseilles was 84,000,000 francs; to estimate the actual total waste, we should have to add the wages lost through drunkenness, the charges for medical treatment, etc. And, viewing the situation from an opposite side, the savings habit may be cultivated as an antidote to the drink habit: a savings-bank book, once started, is in itself an eloquent temperance tract.

—The measures adopted at Marseilles in pursuance of this idea can be only very briefly indicated here. Naturally they were on a modest scale, being restricted alike by the money means available and by the legal restrictions with which a savings bank is necessarily safeguarded. The bank employed 160,000 francs of its own funds in building model dwelling-houses, with gardens, for workingmen, on the theory that if a man's home is made pleasant for him, he will not spend his evenings and his earnings in the cabaret; it also formed a stock company, with a capital of 250,000 francs, for the same purpose; it began a system of loans on mortgage to workingmen who wished to build their own homes; this led to the formation of the first coöperative building association established in France. A step in another direction was the establishment of school savings-banks with a view to instilling economy in the rising generation. From 198 deposits amounting to a total of 2,221 francs in 1887, the figures rose to 12,640 deposits amounting to 33,324 francs in 1891, and the number of participating schools has grown from 16 to 99; in the present year not only the municipal, but also the private and the church schools have joined. To stimulate the saving of small sums and get them away from the liquor-dealers, stamps are sold, of the value of two cents each, and when ten of them are pasted on a card, they can be deposited, a franc being the smallest amount a savings-bank can lawfully receive on deposit. Further, a series of popular lectures were delivered in different parts of the city, by the young physicians of the hospitals, on the specific diseases and the increased mortality directly caused by alcoholism, thus making an appeal to the selfish, prudential motives; and a very effective pamphlet on the respective effects of the bar-room and the savings-bank on independence, health, and happiness has been prepared and distributed. As all of the measures just enumerated date back only two or three years, they have hardly as yet produced an appreciable result; still, the consumption of liquors in 1891 exceeds that of 1890 by only 700 gallons, while the increase of 1890 over 1889 was 80,000 gallons. It is proposed to continue the good work by forming a league which shall pursue, on a larger scale, the methods already begun, and shall supplement them with more ambitious efforts. It is also proposed to stimulate the courts to a more rigorous execution of existing laws, as, for instance, the law prohibiting the sale of liquor within a certain distance of school-houses, etc., and to promote the enactment of such additional restrictive laws as may seem required. There is no idea of a resort to prohibitory legislation such as we know it.

—'To the Snows of Tibet through China,' by A. E. Pratt (Longmans, Green & Co.), is an account of several journeys of a naturalist in search of rare insects and birds. This object, however, is kept wholly subordinate in his book, which is an unusually fresh and interesting description of regions still very rarely visited by Europeans. To reach his collecting grounds it was necessary to ascend the upper Yang-tze by boat, probably the most perilous navigation in the world. In some of the gorges the boats have to be pulled up rapids by scores of men who crawl along paths a few inches wide on the face of cliffs a hundred feet above the raging waters. The loss of life is appalling, and on certain nights of the year there can be seen "thousands of tiny lighted lamps floating upon the river, offerings for the souls of those who have lost their lives by drowning." Of some of the ravines in the mountains which border on Tibet, Mr. Pratt says that it is quite possible to talk to a man across one of them where it would perhaps take a two days' journey to reach him, "so deep and precipitous are they, and dangerous to traverse." In this region is the sacred Mount Omêi, on whose summit, 11,100 feet high, formerly stood a magnificent bronze temple, now destroyed by lightning. Myriads of pilgrims flock to the spot in the hope of seeing the "Glory of Buddha." Mr. Pratt, who saw this phenomenon, is in some doubt as to its origin. He says "it is apparently the reflection of the sun upon the upper surface of the clouds beneath, and has the appearance of a golden disc surrounded by radiating bars, bearing all the colors of the rainbow. These are constantly moving, and scintillate and change color in a very remarkable manner." The vision excites the pilgrims to such a pitch of religious fervor that many throw themselves over the frightful precipice into the clouds upon which it appears, "their bodies, as a rule, falling upon an inaccessible spur covered with forest, perhaps a mile or more below." Though his journeys were made before the recent outbreaks against foreigners, Mr. Pratt was subjected to frequent annoyances, and at times his life was in some danger from the hostility of the natives. They could not understand his motives in coming among them, and believed him to be collecting children's eyes for magical purposes. Very severe winter weather was attributed to his presence. The Chinese are "a credulous and cowardly race," is his sweeping judgment of them. He makes numerous references to the French missionaries, of whose heroic devotion to their self-denying work he speaks most warmly, though of the measure of its success he gives us no means of judging, except that the Christian natives were his most faithful and intelligent collectors and servants. There are some striking illustrations from his photographs, and three appendices giving lists of the most important parts of his collections.

—Léon Cladel, who died at Sèvres on July 21, was a writer who belonged to that recent past which is always more remote from the present than if it were a century off. The height of bad taste is always the taste of the epoch which has just gone by, and Léon Cladel, who was a Romanticist, with a spice of the Parnassian in him, has had but little to say to readers of the last decade. He was born at Montauban in 1835, and, after he had taken his degree of bachelor in law, came to Paris to seek his fortune. Here he found two useful friends—Baudelaire, who recognized and encouraged his literary vocation, and Gambetta, to whom he was drawn as a child of the Midi and a fellow-Republican. His first novels were socialistic, almost revolutionary. 'Va-nu-pieds' and the 'Martyrs ridicules' are novels whose chief characters are of the oppressed and disinherited of the earth, whose sufferings push them toward revolt rather than towards resignation. His best work may probably be found in his 'Bouscassié' and in 'Montauban-Tu-Ne-Le-Sauras-Pas.' Later he gave himself over utterly to the rhetoric of freak and whim, and became a stylist for style's sake. One of his last performances was a series of newspaper articles, "Images Versicolores," in which he attempted to reproduce, by means of literary style, the sensations of color, light, and motion which certain well-known pictures give. He had also "views" about the consonants which recall Rimbaud's far famed sonnet on the colors of the vowels. This sort of work did not lead him directly to the temple of fortune, and he passed his later years at Sèvres, in a very modest dwelling, surrounded by his children and goats and dogs and fowls, all of whom lived together on a footing of delightful equality. His dogs, however, were said to be somewhat better combed and brushed than he—but this may well be due to some individuality of taste on their part, for, of Cladel himself, the laughers of Paris long ago said that whenever he made one of his rare toilets, he always ended the work by sticking a few straws in his hair. He left behind him more than the laughers—many sincere friends. Indeed, it is likely that many of the laughers were his sincere friends The Paris newspapers treat his memory generously, even tenderly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JANNET'S CAPITAL.

Le Capital, la Spéculation et la Finance au XIXe Siècle. Par Claudio Jannet. Paris: Librairie Plon. 1892.. 8vo, pp. viii, 607.

M. CLAUDIO JANNET'S latest book is an important and valuable addition to economic literature, and its value is enhanced by its attractive and readable style—a quality which should secure him a larger audience than is usually reached by writers on this science. M. Jannet is Professor of Political Economy at the Catholic Institute of Paris, and a disciple of Le Play, the founder of the "Unions de la Paix Sociale." He has at ready command the formidable apparatus of erudition which was originally set up by Roscher and now forms the necessary outfit of the veriest tyro in economics; he draws his materials from books, Government reports, reviews, magazines, and newspapers; his citations range from the Fathers of the Church to the *Nation* and the London *Economist*, the latter as late as April 9, 1892. If he had done nothing but bring together from so many sources the useful facts and statistics bearing upon the varied topics he treats, he would have earned the gratitude of all who take an interest in political economy; but, in addition to this, he marshals his materials so as to rear a formidable bulwark against the assaults of socialistic and sentimental opponents of existing institutions. Although his book is in the first instance expository and only incidentally controversial, he never hesitates to express his views on every controverted question, or to grapple with any assailant of what he considers the true doctrine; but however positive his avowal of the faith that is in him, and his condemnation of heretical teachings, he never oversteps the bounds of urbanity.

In his opening sentence he strikes the keynote of his book. Inequality of conditions, he says, is a law of humanity, and is, moreover, necessary to the development of civilization. He quotes with approval the dictum of Le Play that progress has always consisted in eliminating the communal institutions and the communal or corporate guardianship which, under the old régimes, checked the upward soaring of the most gifted individuals and brought them back to the commonplace dead level. Democracy, he continues, while recognizing equality before the law and the equal right of all to share in the government, by no means implies the levelling of wealth. The experience of a century, whether in Europe, America, or Australia, shows the greatest spread of the democratic principle coincident with a large development of inequality of wealth. This state of things he considers no impairment of the condition of the masses, but rather a benefit. Wages are highest where there is most wealth. He recurs to this idea in various parts of his book, and approaches it from various points of view. Thus, in another place, he shows how, in a wealthy community, labor is in continuous demand, and not only better paid, but more sure of steady employment. Capital seeks labor, and, as is shown by the constantly declining rate of interest, contents itself with a steadily diminishing share of the profit. In this way the increased wealth of the upper and middle classes is the direct cause —the mechanical cause, he calls it—of the amelioration in the condition of the working classes. Elsewhere, again, he recurs to another phase of the same thought when he illustrates, by a variety of instances, how the large fortunes gained in modern industry are a benefit to the community. Thus, to select only two or three of the cases he cites, the millions amassed by Bessemer are insignificant when compared with the development he gave to the steel manufacture and with the immense reduction in the cost of transportation resulting from it; Bass, the brewer, is said to have paid a million of dollars in a single year to railroads and steamships for freight charges, so that what he caused others to gain is much more than what he gained himself; many millions of money have been expended, mostly in wages, in experimenting and in perfecting new processes.

All of this, it will be seen, plainly implies a repudiation of Henry George's contention that while the rich grow richer the poor grow poorer, and do not get their fair share of the world's increasing wealth. But M. Jannet directly challenges the truthfulness of the alleged facts on which this contention is based. He maintains, on the contrary, that the improvement in the condition of the working classes is shown in many ways: in countries where there is an accumulation of capital, native workmen disdain the lower kinds of labor and abandon them to immigrants from poorer communities; the British Army is recruited mostly from the Irish, and its moral level is steadily declining; in the building trades in Paris wages have doubled since 1830, while the cost of living has risen only 40 per cent.; the large amounts of money deposited everywhere in savings-banks afford a good indication of this, especially when taken in connection with the evident and vast improvement in the standard of living.

Another assertion of the Socialists, closely allied with that just referred to, is to the effect that the earth could support a larger population if wealth were equally divided. With this also M. Jannet takes issue, saying that its best refutation is found in the rapid growth of the Western populations during the present century, when all barriers to the development of individuality were taken down, as compared with the slow increase of previous ages. He contends that modern luxury, being expended on manufactures, enables a larger population to live and to live better than would otherwise be the case; the demand for luxuries stimulates their production, and cheapens it to such a degree that they presently fall into the category of the necessaries of life and are brought within the reach of the humblest classes. He shows that, even in so glaring a case as the Scotch deer preserves, the keepers and other retainers who get their living from them outnumber the families of the crofters who formerly eked out a miserable existence by raising oats. He adds that the principal causes which prevent population from attaining its possible limits in our time are the expenditure of the masses for tobacco and alcohol, and the destruction due to the wars and the armed peace of modern Europe.

But then, how about the "capitalistic production" which Karl Marx and his followers denounce so violently? Here, too, M. Jannet is ready with facts and arguments. The essential things to be noted are that with the development of industry the share of the profit taken by capital goes on diminishing, while the total amount paid to the laboring class and the amount paid to each laborer go on increasing; that by the employment of costly machinery the productive power of the laborer is vastly multiplied, so that if he receives only one-third of the value of his product, he gets more than its whole value would be in a primitive system of industry; that while a small private manufacturer could not long afford to work at a loss, but would have to stop in bad times and throw his hands out of employment, the rich corporations of our day can and often do run their factories for years without paying dividends, although wages are paid all the time; large profits are now exceptional, and not more frequent than is necessary to tempt capital to incur risks. Karl Marx, however, asserts that a laborer produces in six hours the cost of his keep; the employer makes him work twelve hours and gives him no more than his keep; consequently, the employer robs him of half his earnings and lays it up in the shape of capital, which then goes on accumulating. In this sophism, says M. Jannet, everything is arranged at pleasure to exasperate the laborer, while the facts are quite different, as appears from a number of examples which he enumerates, but of which we can here reproduce only two. In 1888, an exceptionally prosperous year, the earnings of all the French coal mines produced, as dividends and reserves, 1.47 franc per ton, while the miners received 5.04 francs; so that if the laborers had received the entire product, their wages would have been increased 21 per cent., a little more than one-fifth. This would have left nothing for expenditures essential to keep the mines in working order for succeeding years, nor would allowance have been made for 127 mines worked at a loss, against 166 earning dividends, nor for contributions made by the companies to the benefit funds of their employees. In 1889 the railroads of the United States, watered as their stock is, paid in wages and salaries four times as much as in dividends and interest. If only those were kept running that earn more than their operating expenses, what would become of the army of workingmen whose families now actually live on the capital of the foreign stockholders? Evidently the calculation of Marx needs revision. Another consideration which M. Jannet enforces by statistics of the distribution of personal property in various countries is, that a preponderating portion of the great bugbear "capital" consists of the accumulated savings of small people, which, by the modern invention of joint-stock companies, are made available in productive industries. The conspicuous great fortunes, taken all together, form but a small proportion of the aggregate wealth.

Another socialistic bugbear is the "unearned increment," and this is subjected to a similar analysis by M. Jannet. Here, again, we can barely indicate the mass of illustrations which he brings in play. A considerable part of the apparent increase in the value of land in old countries is only on paper, and has only kept pace with the general rise in prices, which is but a disguised expression of the depreciation of the precious metals; another part is due to the decline in the rate of interest, and results from multiplying the annual revenue by a larger coefficient. According to Mr. Giffen, the selling price of land in England was eighteen times a year's rent in 1679, twenty-two times in 1766, and thirty times in 1880. Of the instances of great actual increase of land values cited by Henry George, many are due to the application of capital in reclaiming swamps, etc. The present revenue of landed property in Europe is less than the interest on the capital sunk in permanent improvements in the past 200 years. There is also another side to the question. Along with an increase of values in some places there has been a decided decrease in others. In New England, New York, and Pennsylvania the depreciation in farm lands during the last fifteen years is as high as 50 per cent. Buying real estate for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a rise is a legitimate speculation. To the charge that private ownership in land is founded on conquest and violence, M. Jannet replies that the present owners are in very few instances the descendants of the original conquerors. Since the tenth century the nobility of France, England, and Germany, with the exception of a very small number of historic families, has been entirely renewed at least three times. The class below the nobility renews itself even more rapidly. It is a physiological fact that families in the higher social strata are less productive than those below them, and tend to die out unless they intermarry with the latter. This process is continually going on, and tends to a fusion of races in each community, and to a downward diffusion of inherited wealth along with an upward diffusion of wealth acquired in trade.

Lack of space prevents even a mere mention of the many topics treated in this book with interesting historical and other illustrations. The functions of banks and of exchanges; the services rendered by speculation in affording a ready barometer of values and keeping fluctuations of prices within narrower limits than prevailed before existing systems were organized; the futility of legislative attempts to prevent or restrict dealings in futures and in options, as shown by their frequent failures and abandonments; the demonstration that legitimate commerce would be impossible without speculative contracts, that every owner of any kind of property has a right to hold it for a rise, while, on the other hand, those who sell commodities for future delivery act in the interest of the consumer by preventing an undue rise in prices; that combinations to raise prices unduly, unless supported by protective tariffs, are doomed to failure through the abundance of capital seeking profitable investments; that financial abuses can be better left to the operation of natural laws than remedied by special legislation—all of these matters and many others are more or less elaborately handled by M. Jannet. He gives accounts of the financial history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of the origin and present constitution of the stock-exchanges and clearing-houses of the world, as well as of such isolated occurrences as the rise and fall of the copper syndicate. He devotes a good deal of intelligent attention to American affairs. In regard to the silver question, he says that gold has become the universal international money, while silver is only the small change of rich countries and the interior circulating medium of poor ones, such as India, China, and Russia. No international agreement would avail to keep up a fictitious ratio between the two metals which does not respond to their actual relative value; and there is no prospect that the leading European States will ever agree to make the experiment. The constantly growing use of banking facilities and clearing methods enables the existing stock of gold to suffice for a much larger number of transactions than formerly, and there is no danger of a scarcity of money. For silver there is a wide field of usefulness in countries like China, where it has a great future in providing for the internal commerce of 400,000,000 of people.

M. Jannet's book would be most valuable for reference if it only had an index, but it may be recommended even for continuous reading. The next time he appears in print we wish him a proof-reader who can look after the spelling of American names.

SYBEL'S GERMAN EMPIRE.—II.

The Founding of the German Empire by William I. By Heinrich von Sybel. Translated by Marshall Livingston Perrin, Ph. D., of Boston University, assisted by Gamaliel Bradford, Jr. Vols. III., IV., V. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 1891-92.

Napoleon's whole attitude during the spring of 1866 is explained by his desire, primarily, to see war declared between Prussia and Austria, and, secondarily, to secure as even a balance of forces as possible between the combatants. Greatly overrating the strength of Austria and underrating the strength of Prussia, he believed that the support of Italy, or at least a military diversion on her part, was necessary to protect Prussia against overwhelming defeat; the more because the minor States of Germany were sure to side with Austria. It seemed to him not unlikely that Prussia would ultimately need France's help as well as Italy's, in which case French demands for compensation could not be refused. For this reason Napoleon seems to have been little troubled by his failure to obtain definite pledges from Prussia. He considered a decisive Prussian triumph impossible. When the impossible occurred at Königgrätz, he found himself in a position of great difficulty. Austria at once ceded Venice to France. She thought that Napoleon, with this province in his hand, would at least be able to quiet Italy, and she hoped that he would intervene actively in her behalf. Napoleon's Foreign Minister, Drouyn de Lhuys, advocated the latter course. He proposed at once to place 200,000 men on the German frontier and force Prussia to conclude peace on terms satisfactory to France. Lavalette objected: France had approved the alliance between Prussia and Italy, and it would be an act of bad faith to intervene against them. Moreover, the French Army was not in a condition to make such an intervention effective. Napoleon rejected the proposals of Drouyn de Lhuys and confined himself to diplomatic pressure upon Italy and Prussia. But Italy, her national pride stung by the defeat at Custozza and the offer of Venice as a gift from Napoleon, proved unexpectedly recalcitrant. She refused the gift absolutely, and marched into the disputed province. Prussia accepted the French offer of mediation, but declined to agree to any armistice until the terms of peace were settled. The Prussian troops were pushed energetically forward upon Vienna. Drouyn de Lhuys again made warlike proposals, which were again negatived by Napoleon. Goltz, the Prussian ambassador in Paris, opened negotiations with Napoleon touching the terms of peace with Austria. These negotiations ended in an agreement, two weeks after Königgrätz, that Austria should be excluded from Germany, but should lose no territory except Venice; that Prussia was to annex three or four millions of souls in North Germany, including Schleswig-Holstein, but not including Saxony; that all Germany north of the Main was to form a confederation under Prussian control, and that the South German States were to form an independent confederation. Napoleon recommended to Austria the acceptance of these terms, and on these terms the preliminary peace of Nikolsburg was concluded.

According to Von Sybel, Bismarck did not originally desire to annex so much North German territory. He would have been satisfied with a Prussian hegemony, provided it had extended over all Germany. But as Napoleon insisted on the independence of the South German States, Bismarck conceded this point. It was perfectly obvious that Napoleon expected to exercise a protectorate over Southwestern Germany, to create a new Confederation of the Rhine; but Bismarck was confident, and with reason, that he could defeat this scheme. In return for the concession of South German independence, Bismarck demanded and obtained the annexations in North Germany. In case Napoleon resisted these demands, Goltz was instructed to threaten that Prussia would proclaim the revolutionary constitution of 1849 and rouse all Germany to a national war. At the same time he was to sound Napoleon as to his willingness to accept compensations elsewhere than in Germany.

Bismarck did not find it easy to persuade King William and the military men to accept these terms of peace. They wished for annexations from Austria; they demanded at least a part of Saxony. But the European situation was critical. There was always the danger of armed intervention on the part of France, and there was also a prospect of diplomatic interference by Russia. The Czar, allied with many of the smaller German houses as well as with the Hohenzollerns, was growing restive. France was inquiring more and more impatiently just what her compensation was to be, and Russia was talking of a European Congress. King William finally yielded to Bismarck's representations and agreed to the treaty of Nikolsburg. But the anxiety of these weeks had been so tense that Bismarck's nerves were almost unstrung. When he returned to Berlin and took part in the triumphal entry, he looked like a man just risen from a long illness.

With the peace of Nikolsburg the fruits of victory were at least temporarily housed, but by no means secured. Fortunately for Prussia, Russia and France could not act in unison. Russia desired to protect the smaller German States, and for this purpose she naturally proposed a European Congress. France, however, desired advantages for herself which could not well be obtained from a Congress, and therefore declined to support the Russian proposal. Under these circumstances the Czar did not press the matter; and, receiving satisfactory assurances concerning his special protégés, Hesse-Darmstadt and Würtemberg, with pledges of Prussian support in the question of the Black Sea, he withdrew all opposition. The French demands for compensation were staved off as long as possible, Bismarck continuing his famous "dilatory" tactics. But when, on the 5th of August, these demands became categorical and were backed by threats, Bismarck as categorically refused them. The compensations asked for were the frontier of 1814, as against Prussia; the Bavarian and Hessian provinces on the left bank of the Rhine; the separation of Luxemburg and Limburg from the German Confederation and the withdrawal from Luxemburg of the Prussian garrison. In narrating the episode of August 5, a few years later, Bismarck said that Benedetti threatened war, and that he replied: "Very well, then war." French authorities have disputed the accuracy of this résumé of the conversation; Von Sybel maintains its essential correctness. According to Bismarck's notes, written immediately after the interview, he declared to Benedetti that if France insisted on her demands, Prussia would immediately conclude a final peace with Austria on terms more favorable to the latter Power than those of Nikolsburg; would take measures to unite all Germany; would throw 800,000 men across the Rhine and recover Alsace. The interview terminated without

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any modification of the French demands, but they were immediately afterward withdrawn by Napoleon. He had been seriously ill at the time they were formulated; his assent had been extorted by his Foreign Minister, and he now repudiated the latter's action. Drouyn de Lhuys of course resigned his portfolio.

During this time Bismarck had been negotiating treaties of peace with the South German States. After thoroughly frightening them by demanding large cessions of territory and heavy war-indemnities, he let them off very easily, in consideration of secret compacts of offensive and defensive alliance—compacts which gave the command of their troops in case of war to the King of Prussia. By these arrangements Napoleon's schemes for a new Confederation of the Rhine under French protection were frustrated in advance, and a long step was taken toward the unification of all Germany. The advantages thus secured by Prussia far outweighed the alternative gains of territory which she abandoned; yet the abandonment of her original demands figured in the simultaneous negotiations with Russia as an important concession to the wishes of the Czar. In the negotiations with Bavaria, Bismarck used the French ultimatum of August 5, with dramatic effect. He had demanded from Bavaria the cession of her Franconian possessions north of the Main and an indemnity of 30,000,000 gulden. Bavaria appealed to France and received assurance of French support. Bismarck thereupon revealed to the Bavarian Plenipotentiary, Von der Pfordten, the fact that Napoleon had proposed, a fortnight earlier, to annex the Bavarian Palatinate. He then offered to abandon all cessions and to reduce the indemnity if Bavaria would accept the Prussian alliance—an offer which Von der Pfordten at once accepted with enthusiasm.

In this same anxious month of August, the final treaties of peace with Austria were under negotiation. There was more than one moment when a harmonious adjustment of the differences (between Austria and Italy especially) seemed doubtful; and at one of the most critical junctures new French demands for compensation made their appearance (August 20). This time it was Saarlouis, Landau, and Luxemburg, with the further suggestion that Prussia and France conclude a treaty of offensive and defensive alliance, guaranteeing to the former her German conquests and to the latter Belgium. Bismarck rejected the demand for Landau and Saarlouis, but dallied with the proposals concerning Luxemburg and Belgium until the situation cleared again and the treaty with Austria was signed (August 23). On the 29th of August Benedetti handed Bismarck a draft of the proposed treaty of alliance, providing for the annexation of Belgium. An immediate answer was not demanded, and no answer, it seems, was ever given. Napoleon had apparently discovered at last that Bismarck had been playing with him for two years, and that nothing was to be gained by further negotiations. The next important episode in the Franco-German diplomacy arose from the attempt of France, in 1867, to buy Luxemburg from Holland; but this falls outside the limit of Von Sybel's narrative.

Just before the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian war, Bismarck had injected into the controversy—by a sudden impulse, as it seemed then, but really in pursuance of a long-considered policy—the question of the reorganization of the German Confederacy. He proposed the direct election of a German Parliament by the German people. This was the dearest desire of the great majority of the nation, but no one believed that Bismarck's proposal was made in good faith. No one believed that the minister who had been ruling for nearly four years with only a small minority of the Prussian Diet on his side, could really mean to accord parliamentary power to the German people. But before the first shot was fired, Bismarck showed that the better constitution of Germany was not only a serious aim with him, but the very centre and soul of his policy. Schleswig-Holstein dropped into the background. When the Prussian representative in the Diet pronounced the old confederacy dissolved, he emphasized at the same time the essential unity of Germany, and declared it to be the purpose of his King to reëstablish this unity on new and firmer foundations. The ultimata sent to the minor German States called upon them to accept an alliance with Prussia for the formation of a stronger union with a popular parliament. During and immediately after the war, treaties to this effect were concluded with all the States north of the Main save those marked for annexation; and in 1867 a North German Parliament, elected on the basis of manhood suffrage, discussed, amended, and adopted the Constitution of the new Germany.

Before this Parliament met, Bismarck had closed the conflict between the Crown and the people of Prussia. In spite of the strenuous opposition of his Conservative friends, in and out of the Cabinet, the Prime Minister persuaded the King to ask the Diet for a bill of indemnity, covering the extra-constitutional action of the Ministry during the preceding four years. The result of this conciliatory measure was the disintegration of the parliamentary opposition; the formation of a new party, that of the National Liberals; and the creation of a working majority for the Government in both the Prussian and the German Parliament—a majority that remained substantially unbroken for the next ten years.

In estimating Von Sybel's sympathetic and appreciative delineation of the first four years of Bismarck's ministerial career, we should remember that during these years the historian stood in the front rank of the parliamentary opposition. To readers familiar with the history of the period, no explanation is necessary either of Von Sybel's opposition then or of his approval now. No German who was at once a Liberal and a Unionist, as all the best intellects and warmest hearts of the generation were, could at that time support Bismarck. They could not dream that the Tory Squire whom the will of the King had placed at the head of the State was destined to realize their aims. They knew nothing of the now famous Frankfort despatches; they did not know how Bismarck had chafed for years under the Austrian pretensions; they did not suspect that he had outgrown the traditions of the Holy Alliance. They opposed him because they did not understand him; and as it was impossible for him to reveal his real aims, they continued to oppose him until they suddenly awoke to the fact that he had been doing their work in the teeth of their opposition. To this group Von Sybel belonged, and this is the story of his change of attitude. But it is nevertheless remarkable that he has been able to write the history of those years with such objective calmness. Some of the men who stood at his side in the Opposition, and who after 1866 went over with him into the new governmental majority, still maintain that the solution of the German question by their old enemy was an afterthought; that Bismarck's prime object was to strengthen the royal authority and destroy every vestige of constitutionalism in Prussia; and that it was only because he had got himself and the King into a blind alley that he fought Austria and unified Germany. We are not surprised that Von Sybel gives no countenance to this conception of Bismarck as statesman *malgré lui;* but it is remarkable that he has so completely suppressed the natural impulse of self-justification, particularly when the justification is so easy. He so nearly effaces himself that even a careful reader, if unacquainted with the German politics of that day, would hardly suspect his attitude prior to 1866. Only in one or two instances, where it is a matter of historical record, does his name appear, and then without comment.

There is nevertheless one point in which it seems to us that Von Sybel's presentation of Bismarck's diplomacy takes color from the historian's earlier point of view, when Bismarck was supposed to entertain the customary Tory predilection for Austria. During the years preceding the armed conflict, Von Sybel represents Bismarck as hesitating, with an open mind, between three lines of policy: that of ruling Germany conjointly with Austria, that of dividing the hegemony by a geographical line, and that of expelling Austria from Germany. There is doubtless much evidence in Bismarck's own despatches and reports to support this theory, and it accords admirably with the progress of events. During 1863 and 1864 Prussia and Austria did, as a matter of fact, rule Germany jointly. As often as the harmony of their joint rule was disturbed by the underlying antagonism of their real interests, the idea of a divided supremacy crops out—notably in the suggestions of Gablenz, which, as we have seen, Bismarck approved. But it seems to us that there are strong reasons for taking a different view of Bismarck's ultimate aims—of his esoteric policy, if we may use the expression. It may well be, as Von Sybel declares, that at a given moment Bismarck would have preferred a smaller measure of success in concert with Austria to a greater measure in opposition to that Power; but this is only saying that he would have taken a smaller gain without the cost and risk of a war. It is always to be borne in mind, too, that Bismarck had to do everything with and through the King, and that King William unquestionably had a strong predilection for Austria and preferred the Austrian alliance to any other; that it was with keen regret that he saw the breach between Prussia and Austria widen in 1865 and 1866; that it was with great difficulty that he was brought to accept the Italian alliance and the war. The principal facts, however, which it is not easy to harmonize with Von Sybel's theory are the express and unreserved declarations of Bismarck himself. Before he became Minister-President he had said, in his Frankfort despatches, that Prussia's justifiable ambitions could not be realized in concert with Austria, or without a victorious contest with Austria. In a speech before the North German Parliament, March 13, 1867, he stated that he had formed this opinion while he was at Frankfort. In 1850, he said, he entertained the hereditary political views of all Prussian Conservatives; but when he got "behind the scenes" at Frankfort, he discovered that the traditional policy of concert with Austria was "impossible." It does not seem probable to us that Bismarck changed his views in the period between these declarations. It looks a great deal more as if he had been engaged, during the first

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years of his premiership, in educating his monarch up to his own point of view; in showing King William, by actual experiment, that concert with Austria was indeed impossible; and in so shaping facts that their logic would be decisive where his own arguments were inadequate.

It is not impossible that our author is unconsciously influenced, in his treatment of this question, by the existing political interests of his country. The alliance with Austria is today so vital a part of Germany's foreign policy, that it is not easy for a German historian to set forth the historic antagonism between Austria and Prussia in all its bluntness. There is a natural tendency, in the interest of present harmony, to attenuate the older differences.

Von Sybel's fifth volume brings the narrative, as we have said, down to the end of the year 1866. In a sense the work finds here a natural close, for the Empire was really "founded" at that time. When the South German States came into the new union, and its name was changed from Confederation to Empire, there was no essential change in the constitutional organization. But there are indications in the structure of the fifth volume that the author does not intend to close his work definitively at this point. The narrative is arrested rather than rounded off; and with a writer of Von Sybel's literary instinct the difference is significant. Let us hope that the public may look forward to further volumes setting forth the history of the years from 1867 to 1871 with the fulness, clearness, and finish which characterize the present work.

Of the demerits of the translation we expressed our judgment in reviewing the first two volumes; and we can find, unfortunately, no reason to modify our opinion. The translators do not know the technical vocabularies of German law and politics. They seem to be aware of their ignorance, indeed, for we observe in these later volumes an increased tendency to avoid the translation of technical terms, even where there exist substantial English equivalents, and to substitute vague circumlocutions, in phrasing which they are commonly guided by the context. When not embarrassed by this difficulty they show a fair acquaintance with the German language and its ordinary idioms, and the mistakes which they make seem due to haste and carelessness.

Memorials of Edinburgh in the Olden Time. By Sir Daniel Wilson, LL.D., F.R.S.E., President of the University of Toronto. 2d ed. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black; New York: Macmillan & Co. 2 vols. Pp. xxii, 282; xiv, 316.

THESE very handsome volumes come into the world under peculiar circumstances. More than fifty years ago the author, then a young man, began a series of notes accompanied by drawings of such ancient memorials of the Maiden City as time and vandalism called Improvement had spared; the worst vandalism, called Restoration, was then just beginning. He tells us that when a publisher was found to take the burden of introducing his book to the world, he cheerfully contributed to the loss, under the supposition that he was retaining the copyright; caused a copy to be interleaved, and began filling it with fresh drawings and notes, with a view to a second edition. He was just about to prepare the latter for publication when, to his utter surprise, he found the copyright had expired, and an unauthorized reissue was on the market, with editorial notes purporting to point out such changes in the city as had taken place since the original edition, but often failing absurdly short of such an engagement.

Not only thus, but the edition of 1847 and the authorized reprint have been freely drawn upon by later writers on Edinburgh almost as a work inspired, and the very blunders perpetuated as history or at least immemorial tradition, to the great amusement of the venerable President. Misled by an heraldic ornament in St. Giles's Cathedral, he had formed the inference that the aisle where it stands was erected as an expiatory memorial to David, Duke of Rothsay, whose horrible fate is familiar to readers of the 'Fair Maid of Perth'; he even ventured to construct for it the romantic and legendary name of the Rothsay aisle. Subsequent study has convinced him that his conjecture had no sound basis. But other writers, carried away by the ingenious presentation of the former view, have transferred the romance to the region of fact, and spoken of the structure as traditionally called the "Rothsay aisle," a name which Sir Daniel assures us cannot be found earlier than his edition of 1847. In like manner, he allowed his fancy to wander into various ballad versions of events in Edinburgh annals, of no more historical force than Macaulay's "Armada" or Drayton's "Agincourt"; but these again duly appear interwoven with contemporary accounts as traditionary ballads.

The two beautiful and not too costly volumes of the new edition are enriched not only by the author's latest observations, corrections, and drawings, but by treasures from other sources, duly acknowledged, particularly the very characteristic pencillings of that caustic genius, Charles Kirkpatrick Sharp. Antique plans and views also occur, and the crowning mercy of an index is not wanting. We deeply regret that space does not allow us to make extracts from this beautiful and authentic treatise. The author, surviving both pirates and plagiarists, and in an honored old age presenting these noble volumes not only to his countrymen, but to all who love the "streets of High Dunedin," has, even while this notice was preparing, passed beyond the reach of congratulation. Every cultivated man, every well-read woman, nay, in decently regulated countries, every intelligent child, has an Edinburgh of his own; and each and all will find something for themselves in Sir Daniel Wilson's book.

Phases of Animal Life Past and Present. By R. Lydekker, B.A. (Cantab.). Longmans, Green & Co. 1892. 8vo, pp. 248, illustrated.

FEW writers are as competent as Mr. Lydekker for work like this, a series of essays, in popular style, treating of the animal life of the past and of the present, with their relations to each other and to the questions of origin. These articles were first printed in the pages of *Knowledge*, from which they are reproduced with some modification and additional illustrations. They relate to vertebrates almost entirely, and are but indirectly connected by their evolutionary bearings. Each is complete in itself; together they form a strong addition to the literature of descent.

Because of its real merit the book deserves popularity. Little can be urged against it by those who favor particular theories, since no prominence is given to theoretical considerations. How the different theories are regarded is not easily determined. Apparently the author, with most osteologists and palæontologists, recognizes in use, disuse, habits, surroundings, etc., factors of more importance than the selection of Darwinians. Some mystification arises from the use of *for*, where others might use *by*, as in the case of an organ modified for a particular purpose, an animal modified for a life in the water, organs originally modified for a purpose (flight) subsequently undergoing a kind of retrograde modification for a totally different use, some that undergo structural alteration simply for the purpose of swimming, and others that are gradually more and more modified for the exigencies of a purely marine life. There are traces of a belief in plan or purpose preceding the fact, or of belief in special interpositions. Cetacea are said to have been developed to fill the gap left in the life of the ocean by the Ichthyosaurs and Plesiosaurs. Mention is also made of aquatic habits acquired so recently that they have not had time to induce any strongly marked structural peculiarities, and of resemblances between Ichthyosaurs and whales that are to be explained by their similar conditions of life.

The subjects are varied, but the tendency in all is to set forth modifications and to trace lines from the early extinct to the living forms. The comparisons with which the work abounds give it a value much beyond that of an interesting statement of facts. In single chapters the range is considerable: that on mail-clad animals discusses fishes of various times and kinds, crocodiles, tortoises, glyptodonts, armadillos, and pangolins, and that on flying animals deals with insects, fishes, reptiles, birds, and mammals; a proper distinction being made between the spurious flight of fishes and the true flight of birds. Occasional expressions might profitably be changed. Flying squirrels are said to make a sharp, squeaking cry, and phalangers to be silent, during flight. We can confirm the squeaking of the squirrels when several desire to keep together, but not when a single one is desirous only of escape. Egg-laying in monotremes is treated as if a recent discovery. The advantage of the upright position and leaping progress of the kangaroo is said to be that the young can be more safely carried in the pouch. "An advantage" would be better in this place; as it stands, the implication is that the erect posture and leaping gait were taken on simply for the purpose, as the author would say, of keeping the young from falling out. A neat protest against needless disturbance of nomenclature appears in the statement, "It may be worth mention that some of those naturalists who are never satisfied with a name, unless it be one for which they are personally sponsors, have proposed to replace the well-established name of labyrinthodonts by that of stegocephalians, or roof-skulled saurians—a term sufficiently appropriate if no earlier one had barred the way to its adoption." A doubtful attempt is made to fix the name turtle upon marine species and restrict the name tortoise to land forms. Turtle is usually looked upon as a corruption of tortoise; as such, its synonymous use has become so firmly established that change is hardly possible. To follow the author, we get our tortoise-shell from turtles, and much of the turtle-soup from tortoises. All of the snapping-turtles become tortoises. The confusion in these names began three centuries or more ago. Early in 1600, tortoises, turtles, and turkles were terms used in referring to the same species. Tortoise, however, would seem to have official recognition for the marine forms, as is seen in an act of 1620 "Agaynst the killinge of ouer young Tortoy-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ses." "Semblably, tortoises live in two places, and haunt both land and waters" (Holland's Pliny, 1634, 'Nat. Hist.,' ii, page 431).

Selections from Lucian. Translated by Emily James Smith. Harper & Brothers.

EVERY now and then somebody born to the English tongue rediscovers Lucian, to the amusement of those to whom Lucian is a familiar spirit; and almost always that somebody makes the public pay to witness the rediscovery. Sometimes it is an edition for the fabrication of which nothing later than Reitz is used. Sometimes it is an essay such as Mr. Froude wrote when he stumbled on "Alexander, or the False Prophet," and found out that there were Cagliostros in the second century. Sometimes it is a volume of "Ancient Classics for English Readers" in which "the original Latin" of Suidas is cited and extraordinary liberties are taken in the rendering of Lucian's original Greek. A few years ago we had occasion to notice a poor translation of some of Lucian's dialogues, and now we are favored with a dainty volume of 'Selections from Lucian' by Emily James Smith, whom one would be only too happy to accost with the civility of a prefix in accordance with Mr. Andrew Lang's precept and example, if one were able to divine whether it is maid or matron who has undertaken the task of rendering some of Lucian's riskiest pieces and stepping daintily, after the manner of an egg-dancer, over the improprieties of the "Cock" and the "Ass."

The translatrix knows her Greek well enough to do this—knows it better than some of her masculine rivals. An idiom is pretty sure to call forth an idiom, the airy tone is well preserved, and the success in putting the direct Greek into conventional English is sometimes remarkable. Only to those who know the original the success sometimes comes perilously near to a double meaning, and a double meaning is much worse than calling a spade a spade, if one may use a trite saying to which Lucian himself gave currency. But even the "Lysistrata" of Aristophanes has been translated into language that would not shock the most fastidious, so that the feats of this translatrix cannot be regarded as unparalleled *tours de force*, especially as she has availed herself of the right "to omit words, sentences, or even whole passages that would offend modern taste." That the audacious "Ass" had to be cut and not bridled merely, is not surprising, and even the merry "Cock" had to be mutilated towards the end; but in the latter piece, by a sad slip, reference is made to the omitted scene, and the reader without the Greek before him or the Greek in mind must be sorely puzzled by the allusion "to the wealth of Eukrates," whose improper conduct has been unceremoniously suppressed.

The enormous literature that has gathered about Lucian, the translatrix treats in the same airy fashion in which she accosts her main task. She gets rid of the question of Lucian's Greek by comparing it with the *pastiche* of 'Henry Esmond,' or 'The Master of Ballantrae'—an utterly misleading comparison; and she has very little patience with "foot-sore Erudition," the egg-dance aforesaid being much more to her taste. She laughs at Jakob's "diverting attempt to wrap Lucian in respectability," as she would doubtless laugh at the thought that there was any meaning under the fooleries of Rabelais. Croiset she knows, or knows of, but maliciously spells him with a *z*, and makes her selections at her own sweet will, Croiset permitting or not. The "Halcyon" she includes, though "the critics regard [it] as probably not by Lucian," but she does not deign to notice that the authorship of "Loukios" is hotly disputed, and that Rohde has been forced to abandon the defence of the Lucianic or "Loukianic" origin. In "Toxaris" Lucian is hardly at his best, to say the least; but that is a matter of taste. Like most of those who have dipped for the first time into the literature of the second century, the translatrix has overestimated what she calls "the enormous reading" of Lucian. One of the most remarkable things about the Greek Renaissance is the limited range of reading, which even then seems to have been made up of "Elegant Extracts." But the translatrix might invoke the authority of Kock, who thinks that Lucian is a mosaic of disjected lines from the lost comic poets, and no lover of Lucian would like to have a controversy with one who enjoys her author so thoroughly as does the translatrix of the 'Selections from Lucian.'

Leone X. e la sua Politica. Florence: Barbèra. 1892.

IN this volume Francesco Nitti presents the results of his investigations among hitherto unpublished documents and correspondence of the Medicean period. His purpose is to unravel, first, Leo X.'s policy towards Lorenzo and Giuliano de' Medici, and, second, that pope's intrigues in the contest between Charles V. and Francis I. for the supremacy of Europe. Both of these matters have been the cause of great difference of opinion; indeed, the posthumous reputation of Leo X. has suffered almost as many vicissitudes as has that of Scottish Mary or Henri Quatre. Up to the early part of this century, it was usual to extol him as a modern Augustus, under whose wise and ardent patronage arts and letters flourished; then his vices and selfishness were made prominent by historians; and, finally, Signor Nitti comes to show how Leo, in politics at least, had higher aims and more shrewdness than his disparagers have hitherto allowed. According to Signor Nitti, dynastic ambition was not the foremost motive of Leo's career. Admitting that he threw the weight of his office on the side of his brother Giuliano and his nephew Lorenzo in their efforts to establish themselves at Florence and Urbino, it is still possible to construe this interference as the expression of Leo's desire to extend the power of the Papacy—an assumption which has stronger confirmation in his dealings with Charles and Francis. His course throughout the famous election of the Emperor in 1519, and his subsequent secret compact with Charles, display considerable political acuteness, and seem to have been actuated by his loyalty to the institution of which he was the guardian. So long as there was doubt whether France or Spain would win the ascendant, Leo played fast and loose with both; but when he saw that victory was turning towards Spain, he sided with Charles, in the hope of securing the support of the destined master of Christendom. Signor Nitti hints that Leo expected to free Italy from the domination of both France and Spain, and thereby to strengthen the grasp of the Holy See upon the Peninsula.

This book deserves to be read by every one who realizes the importance of the first quarter of the sixteenth century as a turning point in the politics of modern Europe. From that time dates international diplomacy; from that time appear, vaguely but surely; the theory of the European equilibrium, the attempt on the part of the chief European nations to prevent any one Power from lording it over all the rest. It was the epoch when statesmen, in the modern sense, sprang up: Maximilian in Germany, Francis and his astute father-in-law, Louis XII., in France; Charles V., in Spain; Wolsey, in England; Julius II. and Leo X., in Italy. Machiavelli dissected with a surgeon's dexterity the principles underlying that statecraft, and Signor Nitti now furnishes evidence that Leo X. was not the least subtle in that remarkable group. It would have been well had he printed in an appendix the most important of the unedited documents upon which he bases his argument, but as he promises to publish them in a separate volume, readers may soon have a chance to examine them for themselves. One other improvement we would suggest for his next edition: he should give not merely the title, but the volume and page of the authorities to which he refers in his footnotes. His work seems sufficiently noteworthy to warrant its translation into English.

Games, Ancient and Oriental, and How to Play them; being the Games of the Ancient Egyptians, the Hiera Gramme of the Greeks, the Ludus Latrunculorum of the Romans, and the Oriental Games of Chess, Draughts, Backgammon, and Magic Squares. By Edward Falkener. Longmans, Green & Co. 1892.

WHOEVER shall undertake a general history of games will find this book of Mr. Falkener's most useful. Just what it contains can be seen from the elaborate title-page. Its chief interest lies in the fact that the author believes that he has discovered how the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans played certain games which have hitherto puzzled all students. There is an element of conjecture in his reconstruction, of course; but his argument is convincing, and he has at least devised a working hypothesis, for he has made out a game which it is possible to play with interest, "which satisfies the conditions of the texts and of the paintings and sculptures," and which is unlike existing games, although akin to them. He gives the rules for playing *ludus latrunculorum*, the game of *senat*, the game of the *bowl*, and the game of the *sacred way;* and a fly-leaf informs us where the boards and men may be purchased for those of us who shall desire to gamble as the Egyptians gambled full five thousand years ago. Now that the very old game of *parcheesi* has been revived, there is no reason why *senat* should not also find popular favor again.

Many of Mr. Falkener's chapters are enriched with brief bibliographies, an excellent characteristic of the book. Like most British bibliographical work, however, these are deficient in references to American authorities. In the bibliography of magic squares, for example, there is no mention of the late President Barnard's writings on the subject contributed to a Columbia College periodical. But in discussing *senat* Mr. Falkener gives due credit to Dr. Carrington Bolton for his investigations. Mr. Falkener's book is abundantly illustrated with woodcuts and with photographs, both of the ancient games and of the Oriental. Especially interesting are the illustrations which accompany the paper on *parcheesi*. Chess-players will find much that is new in Mr. Falkener's discussion of the methods of playing this most fascinating of games—in China and in Japan, in Burmah, in Siam, and in India. Altogether, his essay can be recommended to all who are interested in the subject of it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Barrie, J. M. An Edinburgh Eleven: Pencil Portraits from College Life. Lovell, Coryell & Co. $1.
Black, G. A., and Carter, K. Natural History Lessons. Henry Holt & Co. 54 cents.
Caine, Hall. Capt'n Davy's Honeymoon: A Manx Yarn. Appletons.
Collins, Mabel. Morial the Mahatma. Lovell, Gesterfeld & Co. $1.25.
Cox, Mrs. M. McI. Jack Brereton's Three Months' Service. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.25.
Dickens, Mary A. Cross Currents. Appletons.
Dumas, A. The Count of Monte Cristo. M. J. Ivers & Co. 25 cents.
Gordon, H. P. The Land of the Almighty Dollar. Frederick Warne & Co. $2.50.
Hardy, G. E. Five Hundred Books for the Young. Scribners. 50 cents.
Hyde, W. DeW. Practical Ethics. Henry Holt & Co. 89 cents.
Marsden, J. P. Job Lot: Sketches and Stories. Philadelphia: Hallowell & Co.
Matthews, B., and Jessop, G. H. A Tale of Twenty-five Hours. Appletons.
McClellan, W. B. The Official Register of American Yachting. Boston: Estes & Lauriat.
Montgomery, D. H. The Beginner's American History. Boston: Ginn & Co. 70 cents.
Moorehead, W. K. Primitive Man in Ohio. Putnams. $3.
Muller, Mrs. Donizetti. Links from Broken Chains. C. T. Dillingham & Co. $1.25.
Musick, J. R. Estevan: A Story of the Spanish Conquests. Funk & Wagnalls Co. $1.50.
Nichol, Prof. John. Thomas Carlyle. [English Men of Letters.] Harpers. 75 cents.
Nitti, Francesco. Leone X. e la sua Politica. Florence: G. Barbèra.
Orcutt, Hiram. Home and School Training. New ed. Boston: Thompson, Brown & Co. $1.
Plummer, Charles. Two of the Saxon Chronicles, Parallel. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan.
Poynton, A. B. Cicero pro Milone. Part I. Introduction and Text. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan.
Pratt, A. E. To the Snows of Tibet through China. Longmans, Green & Co. $5.
Ralph, Julian. On Canada's Frontier. Harpers. $2.50.
Rathborne, St. George. The Colonel by Brevet. St. Paul: Price-McGill Co. 50 cents.
Rickoff, Rebecca D. A Supplementary First Reader. American Book Co. 25 cents.
Robert, Paul. Zur Heerschaft der Seele. Leipzig: Otto Wiegand.
Russell, Dora. The Other Bond. John A. Taylor & Co. 50 cents.
Schubin, Ossip. The Hand of Destiny. Worthington Co. 25 cents.
Schultz, Jeanne. Jean de Kerdren. Appletons. $1.50.
Shaw, Prof. E. R. English Composition by Practice. Henry Holt & Co. 75 cents.
Sidgwick, Alfred. Distinction and the Criticism of Beliefs. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.75.
Smith, Goldwin. A Trip to England. New ed. Macmillan. 75 cents.
Spencer, H. The Principles of Ethics. Vol. I. Appletons.
Stevenson, R. L. A Footnote to History: Eight Years of Trouble in Samoa. Scribners. $1.50.
Trumbull, M. M. The Free Trade Struggle in England. 2d ed., revised and enlarged. Chicago: *Open Court* Publishing Co. 75 cents.
Tucker, G. J. Legends of the Netherlands. Concord Coöperative Printing Co.
Wagner, C. Jeunesse. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.
Westland, Albert. The Wife and Mother: A Medical Guide. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston, Son & Co. $2.

HENRY HOLT & CO.

PUBLISH THIS WEEK:

VON JAGEMANN'S

Elements of German Syntax.

With Special Reference to Prose Composition. By Prof. H. C. G. von Jagemann of Harvard. 12mo, 176 pp. Teachers price, 80 cents; by mail, 89 cents. The treatment of German syntax is from the point of view of the English language, and based upon the difficulties which, in the author's experience, pupils translating German into English have most often met.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED:

SHAW'S

English Composition

By Practice. On an inductive plan. By Prof. Edward R. Shaw of the University of the City of New York. 12mo, illustrated, 215 pp. Teachers' price, 75 cents; by mail, 83 cents. Attractive stories and sketches are first studied, and the pupil led to observe the application of the simplest principles of composition. Rules are formulated on the basis of this observation.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BALTIMORE.

Announcements for the next academic year are now ready and will be sent on application.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell bills of exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make collections and issue Commercial and Travelers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,

NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

40c. *EACH.—J. Grant's 'Romance of War' and 'Aide-de-Camp,' Sue's 'Wandering Jew' and 'Mysteries of Paris,' 'Old London Bridge,' Carleton's 'Emigrants.' 'Rabelais.'* Mailed promptly. PRATT, 155 6th Ave., N. Y.

SPECIAL CATALOGUES, describing HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & Co.'s Books of *Art, Biography, Essays, Fiction, History, Poetry, Politics, Religion, Science,* and *Travel,* will be sent to any address upon application. 4 Park St., Boston.

READY AUGUST 20:

Select Cases on Evidence

AT THE COMMON LAW.

WITH NOTES.

A Text-Book for Students. By JAMES BRADLEY THAYER, LL.D., Professor of Law at Harvard University.

One volume, pp. 1,200. Cloth, strongly sewed, $7.50, net; half calf, $8.50, net.

Orders received by

CHARLES W. SEVER, PUBLISHER,

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

EUROPEAN SUMMER AND WINTER Resort, University town of Innsbruck, Tirol, Austria; 1,900 feet above the sea, with dry, bracing climate. Hotel Tirol, open all the year. C. rl Landsee, Proprietor. Large, airy, sunny rooms, well furnished. Elevator. Superior cuisine (table d'hôte or à la carte). Reduced rates in winter. Carriages and sleighs at low rates. Charming excursions made from the hotel at all seasons. Unusual advantages for securing teachers of the languages, history, science, art, music, etc., at very moderate terms. Eminent medical care and skilled nurses if desired. Best English and American references. Illustrated pamphlets sent on application.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

254 Fifth Ave., between 28th and 29th Sts., New York, Importer of Foreign Books, Agent for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. A large assortment always on hand, and new books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

AUTOGRAPH LETTERS.

SEND FOR PRICE LISTS.

WALTER R. BENJAMIN,

28 WEST 23D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

EDITEUR ET LIBRAIRE FRANÇAIS

WILLIAM R. JENKINS

851-853 6e AVENUE, NEW YORK coin de 48e rue.

Catalogue envoyé franco sur demande.

Foreign Books. Subscription to foreign periodicals, Tauchnitz British and Authors. Catalogues on application. CARL SCHOENHOF, 144 Tremont St., Boston.

Horsford's

ACID PHOSPHATE,

Recommended and prescribed by physicians of all schools

FOR

DYSPEPSIA, NERVOUSNESS EXHAUSTION,

and all diseases arising from imperfect digestion and derangements of the nervous system.

It aids digestion, and is a brain and nerve food.

Descriptive Pamphlet free.

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

Our new **Book Catalogue** not only gives the size and price of all the standard works on Homœopathy, but an interesting description of each, together with opinions of the press and of physicians. Mailed free.

BOERICKE & TAFEL,

Homœopathic Pharmacists and Publishers,

1011 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

Established in 1835.

Common Words Difficult to Spell.

A practical spelling-book containing 3,500 words that experience has shown are most frequently misspelled. Dictation Exercises from Lowell, Hawthorne, Emerson, Irving, Addison, etc. Cordially endorsed by superintendents and teachers. Specimen copy, postpaid, 24 cents. JAMES H. PENNIMAN, 4322 Sansom Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Bond Box of many an Eastern investor contains securities from our office. We handle only safe investments, paying good rates of interest. Write us for list and circulars. FAIRHAVEN, *Washington.* GAMWELL & WARNER, Investment Bankers.

CROSBY'S VITALIZED PHOSPHITES

The *only* Brain and Nerve Food from the phosphoid principle of the *ox brain* and embryo of wheat.

Largely used, with best results, for *preventing*, as well as curing nervous breakdown.

It restores weakened mental and physical vigor.

It is a *vital* PHOSPHITE, not a laboratory PHOSPHATE.

Pamphlet, with full information, free.

F. CROSBY CO., 56 WEST 25TH ST., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED